iscte INSTITUTO UNIVERSITÁRIO DE LISBOA

School of Social Sciences

Social and Organizational Psychology Department

How do Polish and Portuguese women perceive traits in the context of gender: A cross-cultural comparison on female social norms and typicality

Hanna Domańska

Dissertation submitted as a partial requirement for the conferral of Master in Psychology of Intercultural Relations,

Supervisor

Carla Moleiro, Associate Professor,

ISCTE- University Institute of Lisbon

October, 2020

Acknowledgments

Resumo

O objetivo deste estudo foi explorar a perceção de mulheres, de dois países europeus, sobre a tipicalidade e a desejabilidade de traços de personalidade tipificados por género nas suas sociedades. Mulheres polacas e portuguesas, maiores de 18 anos, foram apresentadas a uma lista de 100 traços tipificados por género e foi-lhes solicitado que se autoavaliassem em cada traço, e avaliassem a desejabilidade e tipicalidade de cada traço para as mulheres nas suas sociedades. De forma consistente com a teoria do Papel Social, conforme os papéis sociais femininos se tornaram cada vez mais variados, as normas e estereótipos de género também devem mudar gradualmente. No entanto, pesquisas recentes mostram algumas mudanças nas autodescrições das pessoas, mas pouco desenvolvimento na perceção e no conteúdo das normas e estereótipos de género. Com base na pesquisa de valores culturais, esperávamos que as mulheres da Polónia e de Portugal fossem diferentes na sua perceção sobre os sistemas de género implementados nas suas sociedades. Os resultados obtidos através da análise estatística indicaram que: i) as diferenças culturais foram menores do que o esperado; ii) Portugal apresentou uma perceção um pouco menos tradicional da desejabilidade e tipicidade das características; iii) as autoavaliações em ambas as subamostras foram as menos tradicionalmente femininas; iv) surgiram apenas pequenas diferenças de idade. Essas descobertas são discutidas à luz de pesquisas teóricas e empíricas apropriadas, seguidas de limitações e implicações práticas.

Palavras-chave: Estereótipos de gênero, Normas de gênero, Feminilidade, Teoria do Papel Social, Cultura

Códigos PsychInfo:
2970 Papéis sexuais e questões femininas
2930 Cultura e Etnologia

Abstract

The aim of this study was to explore the perception of women from two European countries on typicality and desirability of gender-typed personality traits in their societies. Polish and Portuguese women, over the age of 18, were presented with a list of 100 gender-typed traits and asked to rate themselves on each trait, and assess the desirability and typicality of each trait for women in their society. Consistently with the Social Role theory, as female social roles became increasingly varied, gender norms and stereotypes should also change gradually. Nevertheless, recent research shows some change in people's self-descriptions, but little development in the perception and content of gender norms and stereotypes. Informed by the cultural values research, we expected women from Poland and Portugal to differ in their perception on the gender systems implemented in their societies. Results obtained through statistical analysis indicated that: i) cross-cultural differences were smaller than expected; ii) Portugal showed marginally less traditional perception of desirability and typicality of traits; iii) self-ratings across both subsamples were the least traditionally feminine; iv) only small age differences emerged. Those findings are discussed in light of appropriate theoretical and empirical research, followed by limitations and practical implications.

Keywords: Gender stereotypes, Gender norms, Femininity, Social Role Theory, Culture

PsychInfo Classification Categories and Codes:

2970 Sex Roles & Women's Issues

2930 Culture & Ethnology

Table of Content

Table Index

INTRODUCTION

The end of the 20th century was characterised by rapid socio-economic changes that are still in progress. As argued by the Social Role theory, gender roles are direct products of the environmental and cultural needs of the society (Eagly & Wood, 2012). Thus the increase of women's participation in the workforce and liberalisation of social and political views led to adjustment of the gender structures. Indeed, previous research suggests slow wakening of the fixed and polarised gender schemas (Eagly & Wood, 2016; Twenge, 1997). As directly related concepts, both gender social norms and stereotypes should have been subjected to comparable changes. However, last 20 years brought limited insight into those processes and the few studies available on the subject of social expectations towards men and women, and beliefs held about differences between them, present inconsistent findings (Haines, Deaux & Lofaro, 2016; Pearse & Connell, 2016). Moreover, relatively little attention has been directed solely to the concept of femininity and the changes it has undergone, even though they appear to be most dynamic (Twenge, 1997).

Cultural psychology provides insight into the interconnectedness of cultural values and everyday practices that establish the expectations and prohibitions governing social life. The differences in values across nations has been widely researched in several ways, allowing us to have a comprehensive understanding of many countries' socio-cultural profile (Schwartz, 2006; Hofstede, 1980; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Vipin, 2004). And thus, countries endorsing more feminine, egalitarian values could be expected to have more lenient gender schemas.

The present study strives to further the understanding of contemporary gender norms and stereotypes regarding women in Europe. A country comparison was carried out between Poland and Portugal based on their differential cultural values scores, especially Femininity, Egalitarianism and Gender Egalitarianism (Schwartz, 2006; Hofstede, 2001; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Vipin, 2004). Through self-report measures, women were asked to indicate the level of typicality and desirability of gender-typed personality traits. The conducted research aimed to estimate the role of culture on the female gender norms and stereotypes. To contextualise the study, following literature review will summarize the most prominent perspectives on gender roles, norms, and stereotypes in social. Goals and investigation hypothesis are presented at the end of this chapter. The second chapter describes

participants, measures, and the procedure of the study. Chapter three presents the results of the analysis are presented in chapter three, with subsections focused specifically on Polish and Portuguese samples separately. Lastly, chapter four discusses the results considering appropriate theoretical and empirical research.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1 Social Role Theory

One of the most influential theories regarding gender from the social perspective is the Social Role theory proposed by Eagly (1987). It strives to explain the differences and similarities between women and men, incorporating biological components. In brief, Social Role theory argues that differential behaviour of men and women reflects gender role beliefs, that are the representation of peoples' observation of gender specific social norms characteristic to the society they live in.

According to this perspective, the distribution of social roles is different for men and women due to humans' evolved physical sex differences, which warrant women to gestate and nurse children, while men possess greater built and upper-body strength. Female reproductive activities are considered particularly restrictive, because they yield time and energy consuming activities such as gestation, lactation and caring for young offspring (Huber, 2007). Those responsibilities are likely to prevent women from participating fully in tasks that require speed of locomotion and traveling availability, prolonged, uninterrupted activity or extensive training. Consequently, many women lean towards functions compatible with child rearing. In foraging, horticulture and agriculture societies that may mean little female participation in warfare, hunting, ploughing and similar tasks (Murdock & Provost, 1973). On the other hand, men's usually greater size and strength tend to facilitate their performance on those tasks.

Social Role theory argues that those innate physical characteristics allow one sex to accomplish certain activities more efficiently than the other. Eagly and Wood (2016) argue that this division of labour results in alliance between women and men, that attempts to promote interests of the community as a whole. As those factors interact with community's social and economic environment, differences in male and female behaviour appear. Because the circumstances vary, allocation of those activities can also vary across cultures (Wood & Eagly, 2002). In many societies, especially the non-hierarchical and decentralised ones, gender egalitarianism is common (Salzman, 1999). Yet, when physical differences between sexes interact with economic and technological progress providing men with decision-making

authority and resources that grant them most of the socio-economic capital, patriarchy emerges.

Social Role theory grown from its original, purely social, foundation to incorporate a series of interconnected causes of sex differences and similarities, both distal and proximal, such as hormonal regulation (Eagly & Wood, 2016). Nevertheless, the role concept remains fundamental to this approach, as it serves as a bridge between the individual and the social environment. Thus, role expectations exist simultaneously within the mind of the individuals and as a shared social consensus, from which social and cultural structures emerge. Gender role beliefs arise through observation of male and female behaviour that provokes the assumption that each sex possesses corresponding dispositions. Carrying out those activities daily leads to creation of consensually shared gender stereotypes, which reflect the content of those assumptions. As psychological research outlined, such expectations have the power to elicit compliant behaviour (Olson et al., 1996), which has been, for instance, reflected in how beliefs about a social group influences behaviour of its individual members (Berger et al., 1980). Moreover, to ensure that men and women are well equipped for their respective roles, societies undergo thorough socialization process that promotes personality traits and skills supporting successful role performance. Due to the essentialization of the gender differences, the division of labour tends to be viewed by the members of a society as innate and unchangeable (Eagly & Woods, 2016). In the most recent development of the theory, Eagly and Woods (2016) propose three processes through which gender roles affect behaviour. One of them is hormonal fluctuation, that regulates role performance through chemical signals. The remaining two are psychological processes, namely internalization of the gender role beliefs as self-standards which serve to self-regulate one's own behaviour, and experience of expectations held by others that provide social regulatory mechanisms.

The power gender roles have to influence behaviour and social structures derive from their essential quality, tendency to be relatively consensual, and the fact that people are aware of this consensus (Wood & Eagly, 2010). Due to this collective agreement, people rightfully assume that behaviour congruent with their gender roles will be perceived more positively than inconsistent behaviour. The reward and punishment system for role-inconsistent behaviour can be overt or subtle, but it is a powerful tool for eliciting conformity (Eagly & Wood, 2016).   Hence, a smoothly functioning social interactions are most likely achieved by behaving as consistently with one's gender role as possible. On an individual level, however, people differ in the extent to which they incorporate gender roles into their self-concepts, and

the aspects which they adopt (Wood & Eagly, 2009; 2010). Gender identity serves as a standard, in relation to which person's behaviour is moderated through self-regulatory processes (Witt & Wood, 2010; Wood et al., 1997). Therefore, individuals raised in gender non-typical environments are less likely to be invested in traits culturally ascribed to their sex, which translates to less gender-stereotypical behaviour (Taylor & Hall, 1982).

Recently, especially in industrialised countries, both division of labour and gender hierarchy seem to be on the decline (Eagly & Woods, 2016). Social Role theory attributes those changes to two major shifts that undermine the importance of physical sex differences. Firstly, birth rates are lower nowadays, and care for infants and young children relies less on lactation. Secondly, carrying out economically productive activities is less dependent on physical strength and size. In the wake of those progressions, widely spread political, social and psychological changes have been set in motion, granting women access to roles yielding more authority and resources. Still, many sex differences remain and the division of activity warrants women less overall power, compared to man, therefore retaining gender hierarchy to some extent (Valian, 1998). According to the European Union Gender Equality Index (2019), the uneven concentration of men and women in different sectors of the work force, and education, is a persistent problem. Similarly, 79% of women, compared to 34% of men, do housework daily, whilst engaging less in sporting, cultural and leisure activities outside of the house. Thus, although research confirms that gender differences, and inequalities they often produce, are slowly weakening, there are many gender structures prevailing.

1.2   Gender Norms

Gender systems are often stratified in a way that results in in material inequality between women and men (Seguino, 2007). They are reinforced through a set of gender ideologies, norms, and stereotypes. Those social definitions often devaluate women and support behaviours and traits that upholds gender division of labour and male advantage. Gender norms dictate acceptable behaviour boundaries for women and men and establish a system of consequences attached to acts that transgress them. Thus norms, are a collective definition of socially approved conduct, maintaining ideals applied to distinct between men and women (Pearse & Connell, 2016). Mahalik et al. (2005) propose a definition of femininity as the degree to which people conform to a series of gender norms.

Gender norms are a subtype of social norms, yet, they extend beyond beliefs held by individuals, which is the essential nature of social norms. Their institutionalized character has very concrete and material influence on women's realities, by shaping their access to resources and freedoms (Cislaghi & Heise, 2020). Social norm literature has grown varied and multifaceted over the last century, as one of the most intriguing subjects within social sciences (Allport, 1924; Durkheim, 1951; Sherif, 1936; Legros & Cislaghi, 2019). Health and prevention initiatives utilize social norms theory as an effective tool for tackling many risk behaviours in a given society. Still, Cislaghi and Heise (2020) suggest that clear understanding of the differences between social and gender norms is necessary for social improvement efforts.

Firstly, social norms are often conceptualised as separate or even contrary to one's personal attitudes. The former refers to the beliefs about what other people do and approve of, while the latter comprises internally motivated judgements about things (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Moreover, people tend to follow norms that apply within a relevant group, the boundaries of which are usually fairly clear (Hornsey et al., 2003; White et al., 2009). Thus, people adapt their behaviour specifically to the expectations of the appropriate reference group, and can change it depending on circumstances. Importantly, social norms are often equilibria that maintain themselves, benefitting no one in particular (Cislaghi & Heise, 2020). Consequently, process of changing social norms, at its core, relies on changing people's misconceptions about what others in their reference group do and approve of.

If gender is conceptualised largely as based on the unchanging properties of the sexes (Prentice & Miller, 2006), then gender norms are constructed around primary features present at birth and remain the most salient human beliefs (Wood & Eagly, 2010). Where social norms are considered to exist inside the mind (Gintis, 2010), gender norms are present in the world outside of the individual (Hyde, 2014), although in both cases it is understood that the mind and the world are mutually influential. Thus, gender norms are already in place when one is born, often shaping individual's attitudes in accordance to them. Those rules of conduct, learned through the process of socialization, can be reinforced or challenged in a larger societal context as one grows older (Bem, 1981; Tenenbaum & Leaper, 2002). Inequitable gender norms reflect power relations that are often less favourable towards women (Connell, 2014). Societal powerholders benefit from preservation of gender roles and people's compliance with them. Moreover, people obey norms dictated by their culture, society or group, but their boundaries are most often blurry (Cislaghi & Heise, 2020). Thus,

changing gender norms poses the challenge of changing the internal structures of institutions and power systems, which frequently occurs through conflict and renegotiation of the power balance.

Substantial part of literature regarding sex-roles, assumes a social consensus. Yet, Pearse and Connell (2016), argue that it is a dangerous assumption. In a given society, there might be little agreement, or even an overt conflict, about gender proscriptions. Different, and often contradictory, norms can exist within the same society, and it could be argued that this is the case for most contemporary societies (Pearse & Connell, 2016). Similarly, the appearance of consensus may reflect the power structure and achievement of hegemony, rather than actual social agreement. Connell (2005) proposes that hegemonic masculinity, or femininity (Schippers, 2007), does not reflect the universal pattern of male or female experiences, but rather is fully enacted by only a minority and coexists with other gender patterns. Hence, the relationship between the norm and practice is not always direct or tight. The very fact that there are policing mechanisms in place suggests that the conformity to gender rules is lacking (Pearse & Connell, 2016).

It is also imperative to stress the active role of the agents in the process of norm implementation and transition. Although a lot of focus is dedicated towards the importance of socialization processes, acting accordingly to the gender norms is not compulsory and individuals can execute their free will to disobey them. Even obtaining the rules from adults is not a passive process amongst children – they are active in reproducing, creating and enforcing norms between themselves, through ridicule for example (Mac an Ghaill, 1994). Children are selective in perception, irregular in their acquisition of norms, and often in conflict with their authority figures (Eickelkamp, 2011; Caneva, 2014). Despite the greater pressure put by the patriarchal communities on girls rather than boys to obey and conform to the norms, attitude surveys among adults tend to find that women have more egalitarian views than men (Slegh & Kimonyo, 2010; Barker et al., 2011; Manganaro & Alozie, 2011). That provokes the conclusion that internalization of the gender norms is not a fully automatic process (Pearse & Connell, 2016).

Considering the role of gender norms in upholding power relations, their deep roots in social structure, and influence on personal attitudes, unsurprisingly they are rather change-resistant (Elgström, 2000). Nevertheless, structures develop crisis tendencies, involving internal contradictions that challenge existing patterns and force change in the structure itself

(Connell, 1987). Seguino (2007) argues that women's increased access to resources, stimulated by changes in economy or even an economic crisis, can serve as a vehicle for change in gender norms and stereotypes. Previous research shows that societies are relatively more egalitarian regarding gender norms than they were 30 years ago (Chesters, 2010; Lucier-Greer & Adler-Baeder, 2011), and that more egalitarian gender norms are positively liked with men's household involvement and woman's economic outcomes (McDonald, 2013; Chesters, 2010). On the other hand, we can observe the reinforcement of patriarchal gender norms through examples such as the backlash against Hillary Clinton in the 2016 election in the United States (Godbole, Malvar, & Valian, 2019). It is argued that political representatives must 'fit' their gender in order to be likeable. Hillary Clinton had experienced intense criticism, beyond what can be considered a fair judgement of a political figure, both in her time as a First Lady and as a presidential candidate, leading several academics to conclude that part of the negative reaction was motivated by her lack of conformity to what a woman ought to act like in the eyes of American society (Godbole, Malvar, & Valian, 2019; Templin, 1999).

Risman (2009) called researchers to be paying attention to situations where traditional gender norms might be losing their relevance. Those situations are constantly occurring, however the complexity of social terrain means that gender norms change in a varied way, sometimes slowly and with difficulty (Pearse & Connell, 2016). Normative differences and conflicts can be expected within societies, as well as cross-culturally. It is, therefore, imperative that social scientists continue to monitor the ongoing changes in gender systems.

1.3   Gender Stereotypes

Gender norms make up part of a series of gender stereotypes that are not only descriptive in nature but proscriptive as well (Fiske & Stevens, 1993). Similarly to other social stereotypes, gender stereotypes reflect perceivers' observation of daily life (Eagly & Steffen, 1984). If a particular group of people can be commonly observed engaging in a particular activity, others are likely to assume that abilities and personality attributes required to achieve that task are distinctive for that particular group. As most peoples' activities are dictated by the social roles they are fulfilling, stereotypes about groups of people should reflect the distribution of those groups across social roles in the society (Eagly & Steffen, 1984). Some stereotypes reflect also position of groups in wider social context, such as social class. For instance, racial

stereotypes might be in part based on observation that racial groups differ in social class (Smedley & Bayton, 1978). Overall, stereotypes play an important role in human judgement and cognitive processes, and investigators have moved away from regarding them as negative judgements that deviate from the reality, and towards a more neutral view focused on the content and the process (Deaux & Lewis, 1984).

Over the years, research identified agency and communion as two core components of gender stereotypes, dating back to the prior work done in the 1970s (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, & Vogel, 1970; Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Agency as an umbrella term incorporates traits such as competence, instrumentality and independence. Communion, on the other hand, encompasses warmth, expressivity, and concern for others. Women are usually rated higher on communion than on agency, compared to men, and those results are persistent across various cultures (Williams & Best, 1982; 1990). According to Eagly and Steffen (1984) those differences stem from the gender hierarchies that most often favour men. Consequently, women are more likely to be observed occupying lower status positions, that do not hold as much authority as higher positions occupied by men, both in work-related and familial context. Thus, it is argued that the concentration of women in lower positions of the status and authority hierarchies, and in the homemaker role underlines the differences in gender stereotypes (Eagly & Steffen, 1984).

Yet, Deaux and Lewis (1983, 1984) argue that gender stereotypes are not limited to agentic and communal trait ascriptions. They proposed that there are several components of gender stereotypes, namely: traits, role behaviours, occupations, and physical appearance, each having both a masculine and a feminine version. Although those components are interlinked with one another, they have distinct properties and can vary independently. This approach allows for an assessment of a greater range of gender associations, and for distinction between aspects of gender that might be relevant in various circumstances and change independently over time. Research suggests that people easily and readily move across those domains and, with limited information at their disposal, assume other characteristics. Hence, if an individual is presented information about a man described with feminine traits, they are likely to generalize that information to other stereotype components accordingly to the feminine gender stereotype.

Since the modal situation for women nowadays incorporates paid employment along with domestic responsibilities (Hayghe, 1990), beliefs about women's attributes should have

shifted to incorporate characteristics associated with employees, which are more agentic and less communal than those identified with domestic roles (Diekman & Eagly, 2000). According to the Gender Equality Index (2019) the employment rate of women within European Union is at 67% (compared to 79% for men), and women's access to financial resources has been dynamically progressing for the past 15 years. On the other hand, change in men's social roles is significantly more limited. Their participation in domestic work, even in households where both partners are employed, increased only slightly (Bianchi et al., 2006; Parker & Wang, 2013; Steil, 1997). Thus, men had neither increased their share in the domestic role or their participation in female-dominated professions to the same extent that women have increased their participation in the work force and integration into male-dominated occupations (Croft, Shmader, & Block, 2015; Reskin & Roos, 1990). In line with the Social Role theory, the shift in gender stereotypes regarding women should occur to match the new reality of broader opportunity structures available to them (Haines, Deaux, & Lofaro, 2016), although the same would not be expected for men.

Conversely, to what could be expected, recent research shows that gender stereotypes did not undergo a significant change in the last few decades. Haines, Deaux and Lofaro (2016) concluded that there is virtually no meaningful difference in the degree to which beliefs about typical women and men differ in terms of traits, gender roles, occupations, and physical characteristics, in comparison to research conducted over 30 years ago (Deaux & Lewis, 1983). Analysis of advertisement and media also found gender stereotypes to be persistent over time, especially for women, although the intensity of the practice varies across countries (Eisend, 2010; Knoll, Eisend, & Steinhagen, 2011). The content of trait stereotypes in Spanish sample, also ratified the validity of the communality- agency dichotomy (López-Sáez, Morales, & Lisbona, 2008). According to Williams and Best (1990) trait stereotyping validates and explains role stereotyping, thus indicating that beliefs about personality should be more resistant to change. This perspective could account for the lack of parallel between the new social roles performed by women and men and the traits attributed to them.

Haines et al. (2016) proposes several theories that can account for stereotype stability. The Backlash and Status Incongruity Hypothesis (Rudman & Glick, 2001), for instance, suggests that those who enter a previously segregated field are likely to be punished for challenging the status quo, rather than rewarded. To avoid that backlash, they may engage in preventive mechanisms that might confirm the existing stereotypes. Moreover, research on the confirmation bias (Higgins & Bargh, 1987), illusory correlation (Hamilton & Gifford,

1976), and self-fulfilling prophecies (Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977), well known and influential in social psychology, offers an explanation for the stagnation of gender stereotyping. All of those theories suggest that beliefs held about gender differences can be sustained and polarized purely based on subjective assumptions, with little objective evidence. It has been established that people tend to be resistant to observations incongruent with their social beliefs (Rothbart & Park, 1986). People might then distort the memories of gender atypical behaviours, and continue to perceive sharp gender differences, despite evidence to the contrary (Hyde, 2005). This argument is further supported by the cultural lag hypothesis (Diekman, Eagly, & Johnston, 2010), which suggests that changes in attitudes and beliefs about gender might lag behind societal developments (Croft, Schmader, & Block, 2015).

Yet, most importantly for this study, a direct comparison between the self-characterization and the characterization of one's gender group provides interesting insights into the complex dynamics of gender stereotypes. As argued by the attribution theory (Jones & Nisbett, 1987), people are more prone to attribute behaviour to stable personality characteristics when observing someone else rather than in regard to oneself. Therefore, women may see themselves in a less stereotypical way than they see women as a group. Moreover, the different implication of the changing social roles for women and men may meant that women are more likely to embrace the new social order and reject traditional beliefs than men (Hentschel, Heilman, & Peus, 2019). Research, conducted by Hentschel, Heilman, and Peus (2019), tested that hypothesis using the trait approach to ask participants to rate themselves and their gender group on set of agentic and communal characteristics that allowed for multidimensional analysis. They concluded that although gender stereotypes persist, especially in the agency dimension, there were obvious differences in how women rated themselves and their gender group. Interestingly, women often rated other women higher in some aspects of agency, such as assertiveness and leadership ability, than themselves. Those findings allowed to observe that despite the prevalence of many aspects of traditional gender stereotypes, in both self-ratings and ratings of one's gender, some change within gender stereotypes is occurring, albeit slower than one would hope.

1.4   Cultural Differences

There is a large body of evidence assessing gender differences in personality traits (Löckenhoff et al., 2014). Men tend to score higher on agentic and instrumental traits,

whereas women usually score higher on nurturing and communal traits (Diekman & Eagly, 2000). Traditionally, two theoretical perspectives have been applied to understand those differences: evolutionary perspective, which emphasises the adaptive benefits of sex-differentiated behaviours (Baron-Cohen, 2003; Buss, 1997), and sociocultural perspective that stress the role of culture-specific gender roles (Eagly, 1987) and gender-based socialisation processes (Ruble, Martin, & Berenbaum, 2006). Cross-cultural research, so far, has shown a remarkable consistency in the dichotomy of traits associated with each gender, across a large variety of nations (Lippa, 2010; Soto et al., 2011). In light of the growing evidence for the influence of hormonal mechanisms on gender-specific behaviours and traits (Hines, 2011), it is believed that biological factors are the key contributors to those gender differences. Their effects are moderated by culturally based role expectations (Eagly, 1987), cognitive biases (Stangor & McMillan, 1992), and socio-economic conditions (Schmitt et al., 2008). A cross-cultural study conducted by Löckenhoff et al. (2014) concluded that gender stereotypes map well into the assessed sex differences in traits, fostering the reports of stereotypes' descriptive accuracy (Chan et al., 2012).

Cuddy and colleagues (2015) propose that cultural values serve as a core moderator of gender stereotypes. According to their cultural moderation hypothesis, stereotypes of men are more closely aligned with the values most endorsed by the culture than the stereotypes of women. Thus, men tend to be ascribed traits that are more associated with respect and status. It has been recognised that agentic and communal traits are, at least in Wester samples, synonymous with, respectively, individualistic and collectivistic traits (Abele & Wojciszke, 2007). Thus, in line with this framework, women are considered, and expected, to be more warm and caring, not only because that facilitates the role performance as carers but also because gender hierarchy by default assigns them the less culturally valuable characteristics. Conversely, study conducted by Cuddy and others (2015) reports that in collectivist cultures men are believed to be more other-orientated and women more self-orientated, proving that the assumption of universal distribution of gender stereotypes might be incorrect. Interestingly, in contrast to most European countries, Portugal is a collectivist country (Hofstede, 2001), thus Portuguese women should be perceived as more agentic in comparison to their counterparts in more individualistic nations.

Another cultural value dimension that is related to gender structures is the femininity/masculinity (Hofstede, 1980). This dimension encompasses the extent to which societies promote and reward stereotypically feminine or masculine behaviours amongst its

members, and the extent to which they support differentiated or egalitarian gender norms. As proposed by House and colleagues (2004), the level of gender egalitarianism reflects societies' beliefs about the extent to which members' (biological) sex should determine their social role and status. Thus, the countries that value gender egalitarianism relay less on the (biological) sex and strive to diminish the differences in roles of men and women, both in public and private spheres of life. Recent research suggests that due to the natural progression and social evolution, younger birth cohorts are more likely to support gender egalitarianism in all spheres of life (Risman, 2018). Results of this progression can be seen cross-culturally, through the loosening of gender norms in a number of settings, although most of the changes apply mostly to girls and women who are progressively more allowed to engage in stereotypically male behaviours (Yu et al., 2017). Those changes may be consequently unfolding, yet, for now, nation level scores of gender equality remain middling (European Institute of Gender Equality, 2019; Fuller, 1997; House et al., 2004; Kane, 2000).

The current study is based on country comparison between two European countries, Poland and Portugal. We based the choice of those samples on the various cultural differences that, in line with evidence presented above, should warrant unique perceptions of gender norms and stereotypes. In the individualism/collectivism dimension, Portugal is considered a collectivist country (score of 27), and Poland an individualistic country (score of 60; Hofstede, 2001). In line with the cultural moderation hypothesis (Cuddy et al., 2015), women in Portugal should be perceived as stereotypically more agentic and instrumental, compared to Polish women, who should be stereotyped more traditionally, as communal and expressive. Similarly, Polish culture is much more masculine, compared to Portuguese (scores of 64 and 31 respectively). Consequently, gender roles and norms in Poland can be expected to be significantly dichotomous.

The Gender Equality Index, created by European Institute for Gender Equality (2019), reports that Portugal scores 59.9 points, out of a 100, on gender equality, compared to Poland's 55.2 points. Portugal also has a high rate of progress in this dimension, 10 points since 2005, contrary to Poland which improved only by 2.8 points over the same time period. The Index suggests that Poland is increasing its distance from the European Union average equality score over time, which means stagnation or even regression of this nation. Women's participation in higher education and labour force is an indicator to how similarly are women and men perceived to be in that society (William & Best, 1990). That notion is supported by the GLOBE study results (House et al., 2004) showing that Poland's gender egalitarianism

score is only low to medium (4.02 points on a 7-point scale) in practice. Surprisingly, Poland's gender egalitarianism value score (4.52 points) is placed in the medium to relatively high section of the spectrum. In comparison, on this measure Portugal scored lower on the gender egalitarianism practice (3.66 points) but higher on the value (5.13). This difference in practice scores is contradictory to the Gender Equality Index reports (2019), however, those two researches were separated by over 10 years, which leads us to believe that GLOBE (House et al., 2004) rates of country practices might not represent current conditions fully.

In conclusion, available cross-cultural research suggests that the cultural profile of Portugal and Poland should be reflected in the patterns of gender stereotypes and norms. Several well-established cross-cultural studies on values and practices, allows for a fairly accurate understanding of each country's cultural characteristics. With respect to the empirical evidence presented in this section an informed choice was made to recruit Portuguese and Polish women as representatives of different gender systems in order to assess the differences in women's perception on female stereotypes and norms in their society. We consider Portugal, overall, as less differential on the basis of gender and more liberal, compared to Poland which is more traditional and hierarchical.

1.5   Statement of the Research Problem and Hypothesis

Theoretical foundation and empirical evidence offered in this chapter sets this present study within a larger social and cultural context. As the review shows, a number of theories have been applied to further the understanding of the content and prevalence of gender stereotypes and norms. Yet, most available research dates back to the beginning of the 21st century, leaving the current changes in gender systems under-represented in academic literature. Although it has been indicated that female gender schemas are changing more dynamically than men's, relatively small attention has been divided solely to women's experiences and perceptions of gender norms and stereotypes.

The current study aims to address this gap, and further the understanding of how women perceive feminine stereotypes and norms in their societies, in relation to their self-descriptions. To augment the depth to this exploration, the cultural aspect of country comparison was added, to see whether the perceptions of gender systems differ significantly across nations. Thus, with respect to the previous findings, four hypothesis were formulated for this study.

H1: Portuguese sample will have a significantly less traditionally feminine perception on trait desirability and typicality for women than Polish sample.

H2: Among both subsamples self-ratings will be the least traditionally gendered, compared to the desirability and typicality of traits.

H3: In both subsamples typicality of traits will be perceived in more traditionally gendered way than desirability of traits.

H4: Differences between age groups are expected in both subsamples, in self-ratings, perceived desirability and perceived typicality of traits, with older age groups presenting higher overall scores on femininity than younger age groups.

2. METHOD

2.1 Participants

The participants were 128 women from Portugal (n= 45) and Poland (n=83). Ages ranged from 19 to 75 (M= 34.09, SD= 14.41) and most participants held a Bachelor (32%) or a Master degree (31.3%). Most participants were single (41.4%), had no children (64.8%) and were employed (48.4%, see Table 2.1). In terms of occupation type, 36.7% of participants who declared themselves to be employed were business and administration professionals (Appendix A). Two employed participants failed to specify their occupation. Students contributed 32.8% of the total sample.

Age range in the Portuguese subsample was 19 to 63 (M=36.29, SD=12.17). Most participants were Bachelor graduates (40.0%), employed (64.4%), single (46.7%), and had no children (57.8%). The Polish subsample had the age range between 19 and 75 (M=32.9, SD=15.43), and participants were mostly Master graduates (31.3%), students (41.0%), single (38.6%), and with no children (68.7%).

Table 2.1

Participants' Sociodemographic Characteristics

Characteristic	Poland		Portugal		Total Sample	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Total	83	64.8	45	35.1	128	100
Education						
High school degree	23	27.7	11	24.4	34	26.6
Bachelor degree	23	27.7	18	40.0	41	32.0
Master degree	26	31.3	14	31.1	40	31.3
PhD	7	8.4	2	4.4	9	7.0
Other	4	4.8	-	-	4	3.1
Employment						
Employed	33	39.8	29	64.4	62	48.4
Unemployed	5	6.0	6	13.3	11	8.6
Student	34	41,0	8	17,8	42	32,8
Other	11	13.3	2	4.4	13	10.2
Civil Status						
Married	22	26.5	10	22.2	32	25.0
In Long Term Relationship	22	26.5	8	17.8	30	23.4
Single	32	38.6	21	46.7	53	41.4
Divorced	2	2.4	6	13.3	8	6.3
Widowed	3	3.6	-	-	3	2.3
Other	2	2.4	-	-	2	1.6
Motherhood						
Have no children	57	68.7	26	57.8	83	64.8
Have one child	8	9.6	7	15.6	15	11.7
Have two children	11	13.3	12	26.7	23	18.0
Have three children or more	7	8.4	-	-	7	5.5

2.2   Measures

Present study used a questionnaire adapted by Prentice and Carranza (2002), comprising a list of one hundred gender-typed traits, each followed by three questions: (i) How well does this trait describe you?, (ii) How desirable this trait is for women in your society?, (iii) How typical this trait is for women in your society?; with a 9-point scale assigned to each of them.

The list of traits was based on the original pool of 400 traits from the developmental stage of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1981). After combining synonyms and close synonyms from the original pool, Prentice and Carranza were left with 75 positive, traits. Included amongst those are the 40 comprised in BSRI, except for 'masculine' and 'feminine'. Derived from previous research on gender-related attributes, 25 negative traits were added to form the final version of the list.

Reliability analysis for the instrument showed very high and consistent Cronbach's Alpha results ($\alpha= 0.97$).

Based on the categorisation proposed by Prentice and Carranza (2002), all traits were grouped accordingly to their gender relativeness, into "masculine traits", "feminine traits" and "non-typed traits". Categorisation used in the present research was established through perceived typicality and desirability of the traits for each gender, and in comparison with a not-gender specific person, that was adapted from the results of the original study. Each category is displayed in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2

Trait Categorisation in Terms of Gender Typicality

Masculine Traits				
Assertiveness	Forgetfulness	Business Sense	Creative	Jealous Tendency
Arrogance	Strength of Personality	Rationality	Conservatism	Consistency
Happy	Self-Reliance	Controlling	Typicality	Aggressiveness

Masculine Traits				
Self-Esteem	Ambitiousness	Self-Righteousness	Rebelliousness	Stinginess
Optimism	Religiousness	Willing to Take Risks	Discipline	Competitiveness
Stubbornness	Enthusiastic	Athleticism	Prejudiced	Leadership Ability
Helpfulness	Decisiveness	Sexual Promiscuity	Life-Satisfaction	Forcefulness
Dependability	Extroversion	Laziness	Intensity	

Feminine Traits				
Cooperativeness	Impressionability	Warmth and Kindness	Patience	Nosiness
Sensitivity to Others	Spirituality	Yielding	Maturity	Honesty
Politeness	Gullibility	Self-Awareness	Excitability	Flirtatiousness
Cheerfulness	Melodramatic	Literacy Capacity	Approval Seeking	Choosy
Loyalty	Self-Criticism	Worldliness	Interest in Children	Open Mindedness
Cleanliness	Anxiety	Shyness	Efficiency	Persuasiveness
Perfectionism	Defends own Beliefs	Emotional Expression	Emotionality	Weakness
Common Sense	Materialistic	Attention to Appearances	Broad Interests	Complicated
Being Principled	Concern for Future	Cleverness	Friendliness	Intelligence
Sense of Humour	Childlike	Naivete	Wholesome	

Non-typed Traits				
Generosity	Adaptability	Solemnity	Secretiveness	Mischievousness
Idealism	Sperstitiousness	Interestingness	Cynicism	Centre of Attention
Playfulness	Moodiness			

2.3   Procedure

For the present study, the questionnaire proposed by Prentice and Carranza (2002) was translated to Portuguese and Polish languages. Final version of the scales were obtained through back-to-back translation processes, to ensure preservation of items' original meaning. Items were initially translated into the target language by a native translator, then translated back into English by another independent translator. Discrepancies were discussed and compromise was reached regarding all items.

Questionnaires were distributed online via Facebook groups, and through researcher's private connections. Some participant also passed on the survey amongst their own social circles. Through those means a sample of convenience was obtained. Three inclusion criteria had been specified for this study: (i) identification as a female; (ii) age over 18 years; (iii) Polish or Portuguese nationality. The Informed Consent form specifying the voluntary nature of the participation and the anonymity and confidentiality of the responses preceded both versions of the questionnaire.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Total Sample and Group Differences

The primary goal of this study was to identify potential differences between Poland and Portugal in terms of perception of gender-related traits. To explore the tendencies emerging from the total sample data, a set of descriptive statistics was performed. First, self-rating scores, desirability scores and typicality scores for masculine, feminine and non-typed traits, were computed, then descriptive analysis were carried out on the new variables. Average responses, standard deviations, and minimum and maximum scores of the total sample are displayed in Table 3.1. For comparison, the same descriptive analysis was performed on each subsample separately, and the results are presented in Table 3.2. To obtain more in-depth understanding of the data, descriptive analysis of each trait individually were performed and are represented in Appendix B.

Table 3.1

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Scores of the Masculine, Feminine and Non-typed Traits for Total Sample

	Masculine Traits				**Feminine Traits**				**Non-typed Traits**			
	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min
Self-rating	5.02	.913	7.03	2.64	5.52	.860	7.14	2.86	4.80	.955	6.83	2.17
Desirability	4.90	.965	6.82	2.33	5.64	.917	7.43	2.35	4.78	.878	6.50	2.33
Typicality	4.97	.845	6.64	2.18	5.39	.871	6.96	2.33	5.06	.877	7.00	2.25

Note. M= mean results, SD= standard deviation, Max= maximum score, Min= minimum score

Table 3.2

Country Comparison of the Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Scores of the Masculine, Feminine and Non-typed Traits

	Masculine Traits							
	Portugal				Poland			
	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min
Self-rating	5.01	.950	7.03	3.18	5.02	.899	6.67	2.64
Desirability	4.84	1.09	6.82	2.87	4.94	.895	6.54	2.33
Typicality	4.85	.995	6.31	3.00	5.03	.751	6.64	2.18
	Feminine Traits							
	Portugal				Poland			
	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min
Self-rating	5.51	.992	7.06	3.51	5.53	.786	7.14	2.86
Desirability	5.35	1.10	7.43	3.51	5.72	.797	6.96	2.35
Typicality	5.49	1.07	6.96	3.33	5.42	.748	6.67	2.33
	Non-Typed Traits							
	Portugal				Poland			
	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min
Self-rating	4.66	.982	6.50	2.33	4.88	.937	6.83	2.17
Desirability	4.49	.982	6.08	2.33	4.94	.778	6.50	2.42
Typicality	4.86	.945	6.58	3.33	5.17	.824	7.00	2.25

Note. M= mean results, SD= standard deviation, Max= maximum score, Min= minimum score

An independent samples t-test was performed to assess significant differences between the overall scores of each subsample. A significant result was yielded only for difference between the desirability of non-typed traits ($t(74.386)= -2.672$, $p= .009$).

For each of the 100 traits, mean differences between the countries were analysed using independent samples t-tests. Results for all 100 items are presented in Appendix C. To control for Type I errors, α level was set at 0.01 for each test. Analysis revealed significant

differences for 40 items. Following tables (Table 3.3, Table 3.4, and Table 3.5) present those traits categorised by the target variable which showed the significant mean difference.

The majority of the significant differences were accounted for by the between-country variance in desirability scores (n=23). Most of the traits were feminine-typed (n=13), 8 were masculine-typed and 2 were general. Amongst those items, Portugal achieved higher mean scores on *Literary Capacity, Controlling, Concern for Future, Being Principled, Typicality, Leadership Ability and Forcefulness,* compared to Poland. The independent samples t-test revealed 14 items to have significant mean differences across two or more target variables.

Table 3.3

Mean Differences Between Portugal and Poland for the Desirability Scores

	Masculine traits				
Trait	**PT**	**PL**		**t-test**	
	M	**M**	**t**	**df**	**p**
Happiness	6.27	7.72	-3.987	65.757	**.000****
Life Satisfaction	6.53	7.46	-2.654	78.377	.010*
Controlling	5.66	4.01	3.755	124	**.000****
Self-Righteousness	2.54	4.16	-4.714	124	**.000****
Typicality	5.35	4.16	2.952	125	.004*
Sexual Promiscuity	2.20	3.76	-3.877	112.514	**.000****
Leadership Ability	5.38	4.23	2.606	124	.010*
Forcefulness	5.91	3.22	6.907	124	**.000****
	Feminine traits				
Trait	**PT**	**PL**		**t-test**	
	M	**M**	**t**	**df**	**P**
Politeness	7.09	8.18	-3.839	72.359	**.000****
Cheerfulness	6.60	7.67	-3.459	126	**.001****
Friendliness	7.09	8.04	-3.212	77.054	.002*

Feminine traits

Trait	PT	PL	t-test		
	M	M	t	df	P
Warmth&Kindness	7.18	8.26	-3.688	67.429	**.000****
Yielding**	4.64	6.37	-3.404	77.671	**.001****
Wholesomeness	5.93	6.93	-2.814	125	.006*
Literary Capacity	5.91	4.46	3.477	124	**.001****
Concern for Future	6.33	5.02	3.373	124	**.001****
Being Principled	7.27	4.95	6.608	124	**.000****
Honesty	7.09	7.86	-2.535	83.860	.013
Flirtatiousness	4.32	6.33	-4.935	124	**.000****
Attention to Appearances	4.41	6.40	-4.922	124	**.000****
Childlike	1.93	2.94	-3.415	123.046	**.001****

Non-typed traits

Trait	PT	PL	t-test		
	M	M	t	df	p
Centre of Attention	2.75	3.74	-3.032	125	.003*
Mischievousness	3.14	5.71	-7.237	124	**.000****

Note. p= statistical significance, t= Student t-statistic, df= degrees of freedom

*p < 0.01, **p < 0.001

Differences in self-rating scores accounted for 18 significant results. Portuguese women achieved higher mean scores on 9 items - 4 masculine-typed, 4 feminine-typed and one general. Polish participants scored higher on more masculine traits (n=4), 2 feminine and 2 non-typed.

Table 3.4

Mean Differences Between Portugal and Poland for the Self-rating Scores

	Masculine traits				
Trait	**PT**	**PL**		**t-test**	
	M	**M**	**t**	**df**	**P**
Extroversion	5.42	4.18	3.001	125	.003*
Self-Reliance	5.42	7.04	-4.878	125	**.000****
Self-Righteousness	3.11	6.13	-9.358	124	**.000****
Willing to Take Risks	5.20	3.90	3.240	125	.002*
Sexual Promiscuity	2.89	4.15	-2.891	124	.005*
Stinginess	1.93	3.49	-5.212	117.868	**.000****
Competitiveness	5.00	4.05	2.477	124	.015
Forcefulness	6.33	4.09	6.505	112.478	**.000****
	Feminine traits				
Trait	**PT**	**PL**		**t-test**	
	M	**M**	**t**	**df**	**P**
Friendliness	6.18	6.97	-2.624	77.910	.010*
Anxiety	5.64	4.35	2.996	126	.003*
Cleverness	5.71	6.47	-2.518	126	.013*
Yielding	2.59	3.55	-2.606	125	.010*
Literary Capacity	6.47	5.18	3.299	111.804	**.001****
Worldliness	6.07	4.77	3.675	113.386	**.000****
Being Principled	7.44	5.79	5.103	125	**.000****
	Non-typed traits				
Trait	**PT**	**PL**		**t-test**	
	M	**M**	**t**	**df**	**P**
Generosity	6.27	5.52	2.531	126	.013*
Solemnity	4.55	5.51	-2.761	126	.007*
Secretiveness	4.47	5.40	-2.594	114.897	.011*

Note. p= statistical significance, t= Student t-statistic, df= degrees of freedom

*p < 0.01, **p < 0.001

Differences in typicality scores accounted for 18 of the significant results. Most of the higher scores belonged to Poland (n=14) with exception of: Anxiety, Literary Capacity, Being Principled, and Forcefulness.

Table 3.5

Mean Differences Between Portugal and Poland for the Typicality Scores

Masculine traits					
Trait	**PT**	**PL**		**t-test**	
	M	**M**	**t**	**df**	**p**
Self-Reliance	4.75	5.99	-3.813	125	**.000****
Self-Righteousness	3.73	5.62	-5.776	124	**.000****
Sexual Promiscuity	3.54	4.80	-3.794	72.765	**.000****
Aggressiveness	3.15	4.04	-2.827	75.590	.006*
Stinginess	3.50	4.25	-2.831	123	.005*
Forcefulness	5.91	4.84	3.149	70.030	.002*
Feminine traits					
Trait	**PT**	**PL**		**t-test**	
	M	**M**	**t**	**df**	**P**
Impressionability	4.93	5.59	-2.525	126	.013*
Anxiety	5.87	4.61	4.467	126	**.000****
Literary Capacity	5.47	4.36	3.346	124	**.001****
Approval Seeking	5.26	6.44	-3.651	122	**.000****
Nosiness	4.87	5.74	-2.628	124	.010*
Being Principled	6.20	4.80	4.342	71.273	**.000****
Flirtatiousness	4.77	5.79	-3.402	124	**.001****
Being Materialistic	5.00	5.85	-2.921	123	.004*
Attention to Appearances	5.80	6.68	-2.890	125	.005*
Non-typed traits					
Trait	**PT**	**PL**		**t-test**	
	M	**M**	**t**	**df**	**P**
Centre of Attention	4.27	5.33	-3.399	125	**.001****
Mischievousness	3.59	5.00	-5.085	124	**.000****
Moodiness	4.38	5.65	-4.150	125	**.000****

Note. p= statistical significance, t= Student t-statistic, df= degrees of freedom

*p < 0.01, **p < 0.001

Lastly, to explore possible age patterns in the results, four age groups were formed: (i) participants below age of 30; (ii) from 31 to 40 years old; (iii) from 41 to 50 years old; and (iv) over 51 years old. Descriptive statistics were carried out for each age group, represented in Table 3.6. A one-way ANOVA was performed to determine whether there was a significant difference between the groups, showing a significant result only for self-ratings on masculine traits [$F(3, 124) = 3.251$, $p = .024$]. Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the participants over 51 years old ($M = 4.52$, $SD = 1.10$) differed significantly from the mean score of participants between 31 and 40 years old ($M = 5.29$, $SD = .699$), and the mean score of participants between 41 and 50 years old ($M= 5.29$, $SD= .790$). The mean scores of participants under the age of 30 ($M= 4.91$, $SD= .904$) and participants over the age of 51 ($M= 4.28$, $SD= 1.22$) showed significant variance on the self-ratings of non-typed traits also. There were no other differences across age groups and target variables that yielded significance at the $p < .05$ level. A Pearson's Correlation Coefficient was performed additionally, which revealed weak but positive correlations between participant's age and desirability of masculinity traits ($r(126)=.175$, $p= .05$), self-ratings of non-typed traits ($r(126)= -.228$, $p= .01$), and typicality of non-typed traits ($r(126)= -.209$, $p= .02$).

Table 3.6

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum and Maximum Scores of the Masculine, Feminine and Non-typed Traits for Age Groups

	Participants below 30 years old (n=70)											
	Masculine Traits				Feminine Traits				Non-Typed Traits			
	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min
Self-Rating	5.00	.898	7.03	3.28	5.55	.785	7.14	3.73	4.91	.904	6.83	2.58
Desirability	4.72	.842	6.46	3.38	5.61	.841	6.96	3.45	4.77	.828	6.33	2.83
Typicality	5.03	.784	6.64	3.15	5.43	.797	6.76	3.31	5.15	.841	7.00	3.08

	Participants from 31 to 40 years old (n=18)											
	Masculine Traits				Feminine Traits				Non-Typed Traits			
	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min
Self-Rating	5.29	.699	6.49	3.77	5.68	.719	6.73	4.20	4.85	.955	6.58	3.17

	Participants from 31 to 40 years old (n=18)											
	Masculine Traits				**Feminine Traits**				**Non-Typed Traits**			
	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min
Desirability	5.09	1.03	6.82	2.87	5.77	.888	6.80	3.53	4.65	.851	6.00	2.75
Typicality	5.06	.868	6.18	3.05	5.65	.747	6.41	3.78	5.14	.817	6.50	3.33
	Participants from 41 to 50 years old (n=21)											
	Masculine Traits				**Feminine Traits**				**Non-Typed Traits**			
	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min
Self-Rating	5.29	.790	6.56	3.46	5.70	.746	6.94	3.59	4.87	.740	6.00	3.58
Desirability	5.04	.980	6.49	3.44	5.71	.757	6.71	3.57	4.98	.711	6.17	3.50
Typicality	4.85	.657	6.24	3.44	5.28	.725	6.45	3.55	4.96	.728	6.42	3.50
	Participants over 51 years old (n=19)											
	Masculine Traits				**Feminine Traits**				**Non-Typed Traits**			
	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min	M	SD	Max	Min
Self-Rating	4.52	1.10	6.15	2.64	5.08	1.22	6.98	2.86	4.28	1.22	6.08	2.17
Desirability	5.24	1.21	6.54	2.33	5.55	1.34	7.43	2.35	4.76	1.23	6.50	2.33
Typicality	4.78	1.19	6.31	2.81	5.15	1.29	6.96	2.33	4.75	1.16	6.08	2.25

Note. M= mean results, SD= standard deviation, Max= maximum score, Min= minimum score

3.2 Portugal

Each sub-sample was analysed separately to examine within-sample variance in self-ratings, desirability and typicality scores. A repeated measures ANOVA was performed to determine whether the mean scores of the target variables differed significantly. Each trait was tested separately, and to avoid Type I errors significance level was again set to .01 for all analysis. Out of the 100 items, 70 showed significant main effects. For those 70 traits a post hoc pairwise comparison was performed, using the Bonferroni adjustment. The exact differences between the target variables within the sub-sample are represented in Table 3.7. Most of the differences were exhibited within the feminine trait category (n=38). Overall, 56 desirability/typicality comparisons showed significant differences - 20 for masculine traits, 29 for feminine traits, and 7 for non-typed traits. The second largest group was typicality/self-rating comparisons which accounted for 40 significant results- 15 for masculine traits, 21 for

feminine traits, and 4 for non-typed traits. Lastly, self-rating/desirability comparisons revealed 35 significant differences- 14 for masculine traits, 18 for feminine traits, and 3 for non-typed traits.

Table 3.7

Post Hoc Pairwise Comparisons for Portuguese Sample

Masculine Traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Arrogance			
Self-rating	3.27	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	1.89	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	3.80	Typicality/Self-rating	.175
Laziness			
Self-rating	4.13	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.31	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	3.60	Typicality/Self-rating	.565
Self-Esteem			
Self-rating	5.44	Self-rating/Desirability	.082
Desirability	6.18	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.71	Typicality/Self-rating	.025
Optimism			
Self-rating	6.02	Self-rating/Desirability	**.002***
Desirability	6.93	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.89	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Stubbornness			
Self-rating	6.11	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	3.40	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.29	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Happiness			
Self-rating	5.96	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	6.27	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.64	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Life Satisfaction			
Self-rating	5.89	Self-rating/Desirability	.097
Desirability	6.53	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.49	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****

Masculine Traits			
Trait	M	Pairwise Comparisons	p
Self-Reliance			
Self-rating	5.42	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	5.64	Desirability/Typicality	**.012***
Typicality	4.76	Typicality/Self-rating	.024
Strength of Personality			
Self-rating	6.57	Self-rating/Desirability	**.001****
Desirability	4.79	Desirability/Typicality	.683
Typicality	5.32	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Forgetfulness			
Self-rating	5.00	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.87	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.56	Typicality/Self-rating	.440
Religiousness			
Self-rating	3.13	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	5.02	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	5.09	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Dependability			
Self-rating	7.02	Self-rating/Desirability	.709
Desirability	7.25	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.50	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Rationality			
Self-rating	6.44	Self-rating/Desirability	.068
Desirability	5.71	Desirability/Typicality	.273
Typicality	5.09	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Typicality			
Self-rating	3.84	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	5.41	Desirability/Typicality	.986
Typicality	5.11	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Conservatism			
Self-rating	2.73	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	4.69	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	4.58	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Self-Righteousness			
Self-rating	3.11	Self-rating/Desirability	.026
Desirability	2.54	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	3.73	Typicality/Self-rating	.066
Athleticism			
Self-rating	4.29	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	6.11	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.42	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Rebelliousness			
Self-rating	5.02	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	3.31	Desirability/Typicality	.035
Typicality	4.16	Typicality/Self-rating	**.006***

Masculine Traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Consistency			
Self-rating	6.20	Self-rating/Desirability	**.008***
Desirability	6.82	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.50	Typicality/Self-rating	**.003***
Discipline			
Self-rating	5.93	Self-rating/Desirability	**.010***
Desirability	6.84	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.73	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Prejudiced			
Self-rating	2.37	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	2.63	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.53	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Helpfulness			
Self-rating	6.71	Self-rating/Desirability	.121
Desirability	7.27	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.18	Typicality/Self-rating	.133
Jealous Tendency			
Self-rating	3.60	Self-rating/Desirability	.646
Desirability	3.11	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.44	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Stinginess			
Self-rating	1.93	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	1.79	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	3.50	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Sexual Promiscuity			
Self-rating	2.89	Self-rating/Desirability	.020
Desirability	2.20	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	3.54	Typicality/Self-rating	.031
Aggressiveness			
Self-rating	3.00	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	1.49	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	3.16	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Feminine Traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Cooperativeness			
Self-rating	6.71	Self-rating/Desirability	**.010***
Desirability	7.27	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.62	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Sensitivity to Others			
Self-rating	6.73	Self-rating/Desirability	.147
Desirability	7.27	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.36	Typicality/Self-rating	.525

Feminine Traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Politeness			
Self-rating	6.29	Self-rating/Desirability	**.005***
Desirability	7.09	Desirability/Typicality	**.000**
Typicality	5.49	Typicality/Self-rating	.024
Friendliness			
Self-rating	6.18	Self-rating/Desirability	**.002***
Desirability	7.09	Desirability/Typicality	**.000**
Typicality	5.93	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Cheerfulness			
Self-rating	6.07	Self-rating/Desirability	.294
Desirability	6.60	Desirability/Typicality	**.000**
Typicality	5.22	Typicality/Self-rating	**.004***
Self-Criticism			
Self-rating	6.58	Self-rating/Desirability	**.008***
Desirability	5.51	Desirability/Typicality	.745
Typicality	5.13	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000**
Loyalty			
Self-rating	7.20	Self-rating/Desirability	.604
Desirability	7.44	Desirability/Typicality	**.000**
Typicality	5.53	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000**
Anxiety			
Self-rating	5.64	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000**
Desirability	2.91	Desirability/Typicality	**.000**
Typicality	5.87	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Sense of Humour			
Self-rating	6.27	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	6.02	Desirability/Typicality	**.005***
Typicality	5.09	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000**
Warmth&Kindness			
Self-rating	6.56	Self-rating/Desirability	.020
Desirability	7.18	Desirability/Typicality	**.000**
Typicality	5.84	Typicality/Self-rating	.018
Wholesomeness			
Self-rating	5.84	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	5.93	Desirability/Typicality	**.014***
Typicality	5.43	Typicality/Self-rating	.038
Yielding			
Self-rating	2.59	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000**
Desirability	4.64	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	4.73	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000**
Self-Awareness			
Self-rating	6.71	Self-rating/Desirability	.021
Desirability	5.84	Desirability/Typicality	.614
Typicality	5.42	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000**

		Feminine Traits	
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Worldliness			
Self-rating	6.02	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	5.86	Desirability/Typicality	.029
Typicality	4.84	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Being Principled			
Self-rating	7.44	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	7.27	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.20	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Patience			
Self-rating	5.09	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.13	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.58	Typicality/Self-rating	.531
Melodramatic Tendency			
Self-rating	3.33	Self-rating/Desirability	.019
Desirability	2.33	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.98	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Maturity			
Self-rating	6.60	Self-rating/Desirability	.031
Desirability	7.16	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.87	Typicality/Self-rating	**.003***
Nosiness			
Self-rating	2.49	Self-rating/Desirability	.320
Desirability	2.13	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.87	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Attention to Appearances			
Self-rating	4.16	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	4.41	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.75	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Honesty			
Self-rating	7.22	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	7.09	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.44	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Emotional Expression			
Self-rating	5.50	Self-rating/Desirability	**.004***
Desirability	6.35	Desirability/Typicality	**.007***
Typicality	5.73	Typicality/Self-rating	.792
Emotionality			
Self-rating	6.14	Self-rating/Desirability	**.002***
Desirability	5.33	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.31	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Efficiency			
Self-rating	6.50	Self-rating/Desirability	**.002***
Desirability	7.29	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.11	Typicality/Self-rating	.193

Feminine Traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Flirtatiousness			
Self-rating	3.45	Self-rating/Desirability	.073
Desirability	4.32	Desirability/Typicality	.295
Typicality	4.77	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Efficiency			
Self-rating	6.50	Self-rating/Desirability	**.002***
Desirability	7.29	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.11	Typicality/Self-rating	.193
Flirtatiousness			
Self-rating	3.45	Self-rating/Desirability	.073
Desirability	4.32	Desirability/Typicality	.295
Typicality	4.77	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Cleanliness			
Self-rating	6.38	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.56	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.27	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Open Mindedness			
Self-rating	7.24	Self-rating/Desirability	**.006***
Desirability	6.22	Desirability/Typicality	**.011***
Typicality	5.13	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Choosy			
Self-rating	5.22	Self-rating/Desirability	**.001****
Desirability	3.82	Desirability/Typicality	**.004***
Typicality	4.80	Typicality/Self-rating	.355
Perfectionism			
Self-rating	6.11	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	6.18	Desirability/Typicality	**.001****
Typicality	5.31	Typicality/Self-rating	.040
Common Sense			
Self-rating	6.66	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	6.61	Desirability/Typicality	.017
Typicality	5.84	Typicality/Self-rating	**.007***
Interest in Children			
Self-rating	5.61	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.04	Desirability/Typicality	.093
Typicality	6.47	Typicality/Self-rating	.083
Defends own Beliefs			
Self-rating	6.56	Self-rating/Desirability	**.002***
Desirability	5.20	Desirability/Typicality	.864
Typicality	5.51	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Being Materialistic			
Self-rating	3.45	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	3.45	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.0	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****

Feminine Traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Childlike			
Self-rating	2.80	Self-rating/Desirability	**.001****
Desirability	1.93	Desirability/Typicality	**.001****
Typicality	2.96	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Broad Interests			
Self-rating	6.47	Self-rating/Desirability	.946
Desirability	6.16	Desirability/Typicality	**.002***
Typicality	5.20	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Complicated			
Self-rating	4.64	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.75	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.25	Typicality/Self-rating	.119
Non-typed Traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Generosity			
Self-rating	6.27	Self-rating/Desirability	**.002***
Desirability	7.09	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.733	Typicality/Self-rating	.161
Idealism			
Self-rating	5.84	Self-rating/Desirability	.109
Desirability	5.11	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	4.93	Typicality/Self-rating	**.009***
Cynicism			
Self-rating	2.71	Self-rating/Desirability	.094
Desirability	2.04	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.18	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Adaptability			
Self-rating	6.82	Self-rating/Desirability	.512
Desirability	7.11	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.18	Typicality/Self-rating	.021
Superstitiousness			
Self-rating	2.96	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	2.98	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.16	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Intensity			
Self-rating	6.16	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	4.33	Desirability/Typicality	**.006***
Typicality	5.42	Typicality/Self-rating	.029
Centre of Attention			
Self-rating	3.00	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	2.76	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.27	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****

Non-typed Traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Moodiness			
Self-rating	4.29	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.11	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.38	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000

Note. M= mean score, p= statistical significance

*p < 0.01, **p < 0.001

3.3   Poland

Corresponding analysis were conducted on the Polish sub-sample. A repeated measures ANOVA was performed to determine whether the mean scores of the target variables differed significantly within-sample. Each trait was tested separately, and to avoid Type I errors significance level was again set to .01 for all analysis. Out of the 100 items, 89 showed significant main effects For those 89 traits a post hoc pairwise comparison was performed, using the Bonferroni adjustment. The exact differences between the target variables within the sub-sample are represented in the Table 3.8. Majority of differences were exhibited within the feminine trait category (n=44). Overall, 65 desirability/typicality comparisons showed significant differences - 26 for masculine traits, 32 for feminine traits, and 9 for non-typed traits. Second largest group was self-rating/desirability comparisons which accounted for 61 significant results- 23 for masculine traits, 31 for feminine traits, and 7 for non-typed traits. Lastly, typicality/self-rating comparisons revealed 57 significant differences- 21 for masculine traits, 30 for feminine traits, and 6 for non-typed traits.

Table 3.8

Post Hoc Pairwise Comparisons for Polish Sample

Trait	M	Pairwise Comparisons	p
Masculine Traits			
Assertiveness			
Self-rating	5.29	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	5.02	Desirability/Typicality	.025
Typicality	4.31	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Arrogance			
Self-rating	2.90	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	1.57	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.11	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Laziness			
Self-rating	4.71	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	1.58	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.16	Typicality/Self-rating	.111
Self-Esteem			
Self-rating	5.48	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	5.78	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.57	Typicality/Self-rating	**.010***
Optimism			
Self-rating	5.33	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.14	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.65	Typicality/Self-rating	.069
Stubbornness			
Self-rating	6.49	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	3.94	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.63	Typicality/Self-rating	**.003***
Happiness			
Self-rating	5.22	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.72	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.73	Typicality/Self-rating	.220
Life Satisfaction			
Self-rating	5.61	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.45	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.28	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Self-Reliance			
Self-rating	7.04	Self-rating/Desirability	.034
Desirability	6.24	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	5.99	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Strength of Personality			
Self-rating	6.20	Self-rating/Desirability	**.001****
Desirability	4.72	Desirability/Typicality	.057
Typicality	5.42	Typicality/Self-rating	.022

	Masculine Traits		
Trait	M	Pairwise Comparisons	p
Dependability			
Self-rating	7.25	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	7.13	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.14	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Forgetfulness			
Self-rating	4.13	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.13	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.50	Typicality/Self-rating	.616
Religiousness			
Self-rating	3.39	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	5.78	Desirability/Typicality	.620
Typicality	5.42	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Ambitiousness			
Self-rating	6.69	Self-rating/Desirability	.018
Desirability	5.71	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	5.82	Typicality/Self-rating	**.007***
Business Sense			
Self-rating	3.87	Self-rating/Desirability	**.003***
Desirability	5.17	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	5.18	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Rationality			
Self-rating	6.88	Self-rating/Desirability	.096
Desirability	6.23	Desirability/Typicality	**.013***
Typicality	5.40	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Creativity			
Self-rating	6.38	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	6.58	Desirability/Typicality	**.002***
Typicality	5.73	Typicality/Self-rating	.017
Controlling			
Self-rating	5.43	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	4.01	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.68	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Typicality			
Self-rating	4.62	Self-rating/Desirability	.420
Desirability	4.15	Desirability/Typicality	**.002***
Typicality	5.26	Typicality/Self-rating	.063
Conservatism			
Self-rating	3.08	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	5.50	Desirability/Typicality	.099
Typicality	4.89	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Self-Righteousness			
Self-rating	6.13	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	4.16	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.62	Typicality/Self-rating	.186

Masculine Traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Enthusiasm			
Self-rating	5.23	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	6.77	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.34	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Athleticism			
Self-rating	4.69	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	6.83	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.94	Typicality/Self-rating	.888
Rebelliousness			
Self-rating	4.96	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.79	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.74	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Consistency			
Self-rating	6.11	Self-rating/Desirability	**.003***
Desirability	6.88	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.19	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Discipline			
Self-rating	6.05	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.39	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.38	Typicality/Self-rating	.028
Prejudiced			
Self-rating	2.83	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	2.89	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.70	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Helpfulness			
Self-rating	6.30	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.77	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.72	Typicality/Self-rating	**.002***
Jealous Tendency			
Self-rating	4.22	Self-rating/Desirability	.016
Desirability	3.34	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.04	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Stinginess			
Self-rating	3.51	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.44	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.25	Typicality/Self-rating	**.011***
Sexual Promiscuity			
Self-rating	4.14	Self-rating/Desirability	.736
Desirability	3.70	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.80	Typicality/Self-rating	.036
Aggressiveness			
Self-rating	2.91	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	1.49	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.04	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****

Masculine traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Forcefulness			
Self-rating	4.09	Self-rating/Desirability	**.002***
Desirability	3.22	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.84	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Competitiveness			
Self-rating	4.05	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	4.33	Desirability/Typicality	.044
Typicality	5.01	Typicality/Self-rating	**.002***
Extroversion			
Self-rating	4.18	Self-rating/Desirability	**.001****
Desirability	5.34	Desirability/Typicality	.581
Typicality	5.04	Typicality/Self-rating	**.005***
Feminine traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Cooperativeness			
Self-rating	6.70	Self-rating/Desirability	**.003***
Desirability	7.48	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.72	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Sensitivity to Others			
Self-rating	6.77	Self-rating/Desirability	**.002***
Desirability	7.67	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.31	Typicality/Self-rating	.194
Politeness			
Self-rating	6.98	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	8.18	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.46	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Friendliness			
Self-rating	6.96	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	8.04	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.35	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Cheerfulness			
Self-rating	5.12	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.67	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.96	Typicality/Self-rating	.122
Self-Criticism			
Self-rating	6.78	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	5.70	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	5.92	Typicality/Self-rating	**.008***
Impressionability			
Self-rating	4.32	Self-rating/Desirability	**.014***
Desirability	5.35	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	5.59	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****

Feminine traits			
Trait	M	Pairwise Comparisons	p
Loyalty			
Self-rating	7.53	Self-rating/Desirability	**.004***
Desirability	8.14	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.41	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Spirituality			
Self-rating	4.66	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	6.12	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.12	Typicality/Self-rating	.460
Gullibility			
Self-rating	3.98	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	3.79	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.26	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Anxiety			
Self-rating	4.35	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.26	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.61	Typicality/Self-rating	.818
Sense of Humour			
Self-rating	6.65	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	6.71	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.41	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Warmth&Kindness			
Self-rating	6.75	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	8.26	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.69	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Cleverness			
Self-rating	6.48	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	6.34	Desirability/Typicality	.026
Typicality	5.63	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Wholesomeness			
Self-rating	5.96	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	6.93	Desirability/Typicality	.214
Typicality	5.16	Typicality/Self-rating	.185
Yielding			
Self-rating	3.55	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	6.37	Desirability/Typicality	**.001****
Typicality	5.18	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Self-Awareness			
Self-rating	7.13	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	5.48	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	5.26	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Literary Capacity			
Self-rating	5.18	Self-rating/Desirability	.102
Desirability	4.46	Desirability/Typicality	1.000
Typicality	4.36	Typicality/Self-rating	**.014***

Feminine traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Naivete			
Self-rating	3.84	Self-rating/Desirability	.610
Desirability	4.27	Desirability/Typicality	.278
Typicality	4.82	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Being Principled			
Self-rating	5.74	Self-rating/Desirability	**.011***
Desirability	4.97	Desirability/Typicality	.967
Typicality	4.77	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Patience			
Self-rating	5.34	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.78	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.37	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Concern for Future			
Self-rating	6.49	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	5.02	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.30	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Melodramatic Tendency			
Self-rating	3.84	Self-rating/Desirability	.063
Desirability	3.05	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.32	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Excitability			
Self-rating	4.45	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	3.31	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.87	Typicality/Self-rating	.209
Maturity			
Self-rating	6.58	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.52	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.77	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Nosiness			
Self-rating	2.93	Self-rating/Desirability	.133
Desirability	2.42	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.74	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Approval Seeking			
Self-rating	5.41	Self-rating/Desirability	.041
Desirability	4.62	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.44	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Attention to Appearances			
Self-rating	4.48	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	6.40	Desirability/Typicality	.784
Typicality	6.68	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Honesty			
Self-rating	7.37	Self-rating/Desirability	**.009***
Desirability	7.86	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.69	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****

Feminine traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Emotional Expression			
Self-rating	5.35	Self-rating/Desirability	**.003***
Desirability	6.44	Desirability/Typicality	**.003***
Typicality	6.67	Typicality/Self-rating	.776
Emotionality			
Self-rating	6.28	Self-rating/Desirability	**.006***
Desirability	5.35	Desirability/Typicality	**.001****
Typicality	6.33	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Efficiency			
Self-rating	6.02	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.06	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.54	Typicality/Self-rating	.086
Flirtatiousness			
Self-rating	3.50	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	6.33	Desirability/Typicality	.050
Typicality	5.79	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Cleanliness			
Self-rating	6.61	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	8.10	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.16	Typicality/Self-rating	.217
Open Mindedness			
Self-rating	7.08	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	5.58	Desirability/Typicality	.534
Typicality	5.19	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Choosy			
Self-rating	4.90	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	3.17	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.48	Typicality/Self-rating	.042
Perfectionism			
Self-rating	6.22	Self-rating/Desirability	.440
Desirability	6.68	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.50	Typicality/Self-rating	**.008***
Common Sense			
Self-rating	7.6	Self-rating/Desirability	.705
Desirability	7.33	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.60	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Interest in Children			
Self-rating	4.72	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.60	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.38	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Defends own Beliefs			
Self-rating	6.78	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	4.66	Desirability/Typicality	**.003***
Typicality	5.57	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****

Feminine traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Being Materialistic			
Self-rating	3.89	Self-rating/Desirability	.028
Desirability	3.10	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.85	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Childlike			
Self-rating	2.80	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	2.94	Desirability/Typicality	**.011***
Typicality	3.52	Typicality/Self-rating	**.001****
Broad Interests			
Self-rating	6.38	Self-rating/Desirability	.899
Desirability	6.02	Desirability/Typicality	.017
Typicality	5.21	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Complicated			
Self-rating	5.65	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.98	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.00	Typicality/Self-rating	.024
Generosity			
Self-rating	5.52	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.71	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.13	Typicality/Self-rating	.155
Non-typed traits			
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Cynicism			
Self-rating	3.73	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	1.84	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	4.36	Typicality/Self-rating	.097
Adaptability			
Self-rating	6.10	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	7.79	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	6.00	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000
Superstitiousness			
Self-rating	2.71	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	2.72	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.04	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Intelligence			
Self-rating	7.17	Self-rating/Desirability	**.004***
Desirability	6.20	Desirability/Typicality	.361
Typicality	5.01	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Interestingness			
Self-rating	5.41	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	6.70	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.46	Typicality/Self-rating	1.000

	Non-typed traits		
Trait	**M**	**Pairwise Comparisons**	**p**
Centre of Attention			
Self-rating	3.82	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	3.74	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.33	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Playfulness			
Self-rating	6.16	Self-rating/Desirability	1.000
Desirability	5.94	Desirability/Typicality	**.011***
Typicality	5.28	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Mischievousness			
Self-rating	3.91	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	5.71	Desirability/Typicality	**.003***
Typicality	5.00	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****
Moodiness			
Self-rating	4.75	Self-rating/Desirability	**.000****
Desirability	2.59	Desirability/Typicality	**.000****
Typicality	5.67	Typicality/Self-rating	**.000****

Note. M= mean score, p= statistical significance

*p < 0.01, **p < 0.001

4. DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to explore the perception of women from two European countries on typicality and desirability of gender-typed personality traits in their societies. Polish and Portuguese women, over the age of 18, were presented with a list of 100 gender-typed traits and asked to rate themselves on each trait, and assess the desirability and typicality of each trait for women in their society. Consistently with the Social Role theory (Eagly, 1987), as female social roles became increasingly varied, gender norms and stereotypes should also change gradually. Nevertheless, recent research (Donnelly & Twenge, 2017) shows some change in people's self-descriptions, but little development in the perception and content of gender norms and stereotypes. Informed by the cultural values research, we expected women from Poland and Portugal to differ in their perception on the gender systems implemented in their societies.

Contrary to the estimates, results obtained through statistical analysis did not reveal large cross-country differences, thus the hypothesis (H1) that Portuguese sample will have significantly less traditional perception on trait desirability and typicality was sustained only partially. The only significant overall mean difference was found between the desirability of non-typed traits, where Poland achieved a higher score. There was no significant variance in self-ratings, desirability or typicality scores on masculine or feminine traits. In fact, both subsamples had higher respective total scores on feminine traits across all three target variables. Still, within the analysis of individual traits, Portugal scored relatively lower on most feminine traits across all target variables, compared to Poland, but did not show any substantial inclination towards masculine or no-typed traits.

Significant cross-country differences were observed in only 40% of the traits, most of which were accounted for by the variance in desirability scores, mostly on feminine characteristics, where Polish women reported higher desirability of most traits. This finding implicates that there is a stronger expectation towards women in Poland to behave in gender-governed ways, supporting our predetermined assumption. Because of higher cultural femininity and gender egalitarianism values, Portugal was expected to have less strict gender norms. Between-countries differences in typicality scores were the least numerous. Once again, variances applied largely to the feminine trait category and Poland scored higher on most of them. That conclusion is also in line with our predictions, since lower scores on typicality of feminine traits suggest less traditional gender stereotypes in Portugal. It is

important to emphasise that those country differences did not emerge in the general analysis, only in the individual trait analysis, and were smaller than within-country diversity.

Regarding the overall scores, both Portuguese and Polish women seem to have quite androgynous self-ratings – high on both feminine and masculine traits. This supports our second hypothesis (H2) proposing that self-ratings amongst both subsamples will be the least traditionally gendered, compared to the desirability and typicality of traits. Individual trait analysis revealed that self-rating scores were significantly higher mostly on traits that are socially desirable, regardless of their gender-type, with exception to comparisons of self-ratings and desirability which showed the opposite tendency. As mentioned, significant differences between subsamples occurred across only 40% of the items, in comparison to the 70% of the items within Portuguese sample and 89% of the items within Polish sample. Specifically, most discrepancies were observed between the desirability and typicality scores regarding feminine traits, across both subsamples. The subsamples perceived feminine traits as most desirable, while masculine and non-typed traits were regarded as equally less desirable. Typicality of traits was perceived similarly, although non-typed traits were viewed as somewhat more typical than masculine traits. Thus, hypothesis (H3) addressing the perception of typicality as more traditionally viewed, in comparison to desirability of traits, was not sustained. The individual item analysis revealed that the differences between desirability and typicality across both subsamples are comparable in terms of quantity and the gender typing of traits.

Although previous research established that younger birth cohorts tend to hold less traditional gender views (Risman, 2018), those findings were not fully sustained by our analysis. The relations between age and the adherence of the traits was found only in desirability of masculine traits, self-ratings of non-typed traits and typicality of non-typed traits, and they were rather weak. There were two instances of significant differences across the age groups. One for self-ratings of masculinity between participants aged over 51 and participants from 31 to 40 years old, and 41 to 50 years old. Second, for self-ratings of non-typed traits between participants younger than 30 years and those older than 51. In both instances, older women scored lower than their younger counterparts, which means they showed an inclination towards describing themselves using less masculine and non-typed traits. This suggests they might foster a more traditional perception, however due to disparity of those results this conclusion is rather tentative. Thus, our last hypothesis (H4) proposing

that age differences in self-ratings, desirability, and typicality will occur, was sustained only partially and in an unexpected manner.

The small differentiation found between Polish and Portuguese participants leads us to believe that some other social factors, beyond cultural values, play the main role in shaping gender systems. Our findings seem to partially support previously established evidence for changes in self-descriptions, rise in women's masculinity scores and decrease of traditional femininity over the last years (Donnelly & Twange, 2017). Although women from both countries scored highly on feminine self-ratings, they also obtained comparably high ratings on masculine traits. As advocated by Bem (1974), femininity and masculinity are not bipolar ends of one continuum, but two independent constructs, which allows an individual to possess both high levels of feminine and masculine characteristics. Several scholars considered androgynous people to be better integrated and more situationally flexible compared to those facilitating traditional gender schemas (Bem, 1974; Helmreich, Spence, & Holahan, 1979). This behavioural flexibility is understood as the ability to demonstrate traditionally masculine or feminine behaviour depending on the circumstances, and is considered socially desirable as it facilitate adaptation to changing social demands (Ballard-Reisch & Elton, 1992). Thus, the development of women's self-descriptions aligns with Social Role theory postulates of personality development in correspondence to social role requirements. In our research, this propensity was not limited by cross-cultural differences. Cultural psychology provides a theoretical and empirical perspective that enriches the classical approach to gender dynamics. Although there is evidence suggesting lack of extensive change in gender stereotypes (Haines et al., 2016) and norms (Pearse & Connell, 2016), we expected to see a substantial difference between Portuguese and Polish women's perception on the account of different social values and practices. Most extensive analysis of the changes in gender systems across time were conducted in the US, therefore an exploration of European context is a valuable addition to the body of research. Present findings seem to support the endorsement of traditional feminine stereotypes and norms in European countries, with little differentiation that could be explained by cultural aspects. Yet, the lack of a more longitudinal perspective does not allow for proper contextualisation of those results.

The sustainability of traditional gender systems in Poland and Portugal can be accounted for in several ways. Many scholars argue that Polish complex historical background, including lack of independence, war time and communist regime that occurred sequentially in country's recent history, contributed to an obstinate stereotype of women as 'institutions'-

54

fulfilling masculine roles in the times of crisis, while simultaneously maintaining the roles of mothers and caretakers (Imbierowicz, 2012). On the surface level, this vision of women seems progressive in certain ways, and it did allow women more freedom and agency at times; however it is so infiltrated by the expectation of silent sacrifice and selfless devotion to the family and the country, that it transcends into a moral obligation. While Polish society has undergone many changes, the constrain of this feminine ideal installed in the collective consciousness can still be observed (Imbierowicz, 2012). Many Polish women report being used to this double standard, while also considering the ability to manage it as something commendable to some extent (Budrowska, 2004).

Similarly, Portugal experienced a period of authoritarian government that, along with the Catholic Church doctrine, repressed progression towards gender equality and more liberal division of the sexes (Schouten, 2017). Following the political transition at the end of the 20th century, many legislations tackling gender inequality were introduced, addressing a wide spectrum of issues. However, as argued by Schouten (2017), this progression is sharply contrasted by much less egalitarian practices. Consistently, although Portugal scores relatively high on gender egalitarianism value in the GLOBE study, their score on practice is evidently lower. Following the economic recession of the 2008 Portugal experienced a considerable increase in unemployment and economic instability (Sobotka, 2016), which was later used as a justification for the societal re-emergence of traditional patterns (Ferreira & Monteiro, 2015). Research shows that household work and childcare distribution did not transform, despite men's decreased employment (Coelho, 2016; Múrias, 2015), while female involvement in care for elder and chronically ill members of their community increased (Ferreira & Monteiro, 2015). The lack of difference between the stereotypes and the norms that emerged in our findings seems to fit in well with those reports. As summarised by Schouten (2017), although women fulfil many non-traditional roles, images of gender have not changed, but re-adjusted to the new social conditions.

Seemingly, recent history and socio-economic circumstances may overpower the influence of cultural values on changes in gender schemas. Surely, some progression in gender equality and liberalisation of gender structures can be observed, however theories such as confirmation bias (Higgins & Bargh, 1987), illusory correlation (Hamilton & Gifford, 1976) or the self-fulfilling prophecy (Snyder, Tanke, & Berscheid, 1977) appear to play an important role in shaping people's perceptions. Since gender differentiation is still prominent, those beliefs held on the individual level about male and female characteristics may override

the observable evidence. Given the widespread use of gender categories in virtually any society, and the apparent value of gender differentiation, people might remain resistant to more prominent changes in gender stereotypes. The way people can easily confirm gender stereotypes, through selective remembrance of stereotype consistent illustrations (Rothbart & Park, 1986), and incorrect recollection of gender divergences as more gender typical (Fyock & Stangor, 1994) aids stereotype maintenance and consistency. Moreover, women making choices inconsistent with gender norms tend to face backlash and to avoid it they may evade engagement in those actions, consistently confirming the existing gender order (Rudman et al., 2012). This is consistent with the prevailing evidence for the essentialism of gender beliefs (Croft et al., 2015). The extent to which people perceive gender characteristics and systems as intrinsic is unlikely to be substantially influenced by peripheral changes in observable behaviour.

The traditionality of perceived desirability and typicality of traits found by us is further supported by the cultural lag hypothesis. This phenomenon occurs when two correlated elements of culture change at a different speed. As one exceeds the other, their alignment becomes less accurate than before. In line with this concept, changes in attitudes and beliefs about gender might fall behind social changes (Diekman, Eagly & Johnston, 2010). Brinkman and Brinkman (1997) suggest that the cultural lag tendency occurs due to people clinging to the old and known ways. There are a number of reasons for this resistance, including fear of ostracism, belief that the settled social habits promote relevant interests, promotion of the social hierarchy maintenance by the powerholders, or the power of tradition (Brinkman & Brinkman, 1997). Economic and industrial development forces changes within gender structures that are not evenly matched by attitudes and beliefs. It has been theorized that those discrepancies stem from the fact that, whilst being congruent with the contemporary liberal ideals (Cech 2013; England 2010), support for women in the workforce does not substantially disrupt the traditional gender hierarchy (Charles & Grusky, 2004; England, 2010).

4.1 Limitations and Future Research

Although present research is a valuable addition to the body of literature addressing gender stereotypes and norms, especially in the European context, there are some limitations that should be addressed. Firstly, the unmatched samples are a potential concern. The accuracy of this study would surely be improved if both subsamples had been more comparable in terms

of the number of participants and their demographic features. This study was dedicated solely to women's perception of stereotypes and norms that affect them daily in their societies, which is a somewhat under-represented approach. Nevertheless, obtaining male perspective would provide an excellent reference frame and could bring forward interesting results. It is possible that in some ways women perceive feminine norms and stereotypes in more traditional ways than men (Iwanowska et al., 2017).

Moreover, the measure used in the present study was modelled mainly on BSRI trait list (Bem, 1974) which is a dated instrument. Although it is still generally regarded as valid (Auster & Ohm, 2000), some evidence suggests that the traits deemed as feminine or masculine when the measure was developed are not fully adequate contemporarily. In a recent study, Ferrer-Pérez and Bosch-Fiol (2014) found that only several of the original BSRI trait list are in fact considered characteristically masculine or feminine, while majority of them were rated as undifferentiated. Thus, it is possible that the trait list used in this study is no longer fully representative of the gender constructs they originally intended to, in which case present findings would be seriously deteriorated. A large body of research deems BSRI a useful and valid measure, and if such change occurred, it would be most likely reflected in the age differences, which were not substantial in our study. Nevertheless, utilization of a more contemporary measures and instruments could increase the accuracy and strength of the results.

The actual categorisation of the traits used in this study was grounded in the results of Prentice and Carranza's study (2002). Their sample of 200 undergraduate students produced gender categorisation of a pool of traits, including the BSRI items, in terms of desirability and typicality for women, men, and non-gender specific person. Those results were later adapted for the purposes of the current research. Curiously, Prentice and Carranza (2002) noted that women, compared to men, were assigned more socially positive traits that were not strictly associated with feminine imperatives. In short, women were perceived in congruence with their traditional social role, but also rated high on several forms of competence not prescribed to them on the basis of their gender. Authors propose that as women have taken on other, non-traditional roles, they needed to demonstrate many of the traits that the female stereotype discards as non-vital. Still, because they did not discard the traditional feminine role entirely, they are seen as possessing the customarily feminine traits and the non-traditional occupational traits simultaneously (Prentice & Carranza, 2002).

Those socially desirable traits judged as feminine despite their lesser relativeness to the traditional femininity were included in our study within femininity traits category on equal basis with the more stereotypical characteristics. Consequently, our feminine category included a full spectrum, from strongly gendered feminine traits to the more non-traditional occupational traits, which is likely to be an accurate representation of many contemporary working women. In this context, high scores of both subsamples on femininity traits self-ratings, desirability and typicality, despite the informed prediction that Portugal would score lower on femininity and higher, or equally high, on masculinity traits, become clear.

On the other hand, previewing non-traditional femininity merely as an increase in masculine traits can be misleading. As pointed out by Yu et al. (2017) the strive to increase gender equality is often performed through encouraging girls and women to be more like boys and men, rather than other way around. Emphasising masculine traits may impose an additional obligation on women, and have negative health and social consequences for sexes (Berenbaum & Blakemore, 2011; Blakemore, 2003; Marcus & Harper, 2014). Thus, perhaps change in gender stereotypes and norms is occurring in ways that cannot be addressed using trait approach, since it does not allow for full recognition of complexity extending beyond the simple rise and fall of feminine and masculine characteristics endorsement.

Lastly, it is important to note that the duration of this study was marked by one of the most intense crisis in the recent history. Most European countries experienced immense difficulties dealing with the outbreak of the COVID-19, which had an unexpected influence on the circumstances in which participants took part in the survey and the number of participants we were able to get. Although it is too early to tell the full magnitude of the long-term impact the pandemic will have, several immediate effects, that are relevant to the scope of this study, should be addressed. Closing of schools and the increased need for care of elder family members is bound to worsen the, already disproportionally large, share of care work and household chores that women typically do, as well as diminish their well-being (Blaskó, Papadimitriou, & Manca, 2020). As suggested by the results of this study, traditional views on gender norms and behaviours seem to be stronger and more unified than expected. Further intensification of those sentiments is possible, which could play a role in women's future employment perspectives, if potential employers foster a view of women as caregivers and men as breadwinners. On the other hand, unlike previous economic crises, this one seems mostly gender-neutral. Despite its obvious negative effects, the instability of work force might distort the persistent over-representation of men and women in specific professions, and force

men to increase their participation in household duties. Women also cumulate in many occupations that have proven to be vital during the crisis (e.g. health care, retail and social work), but are not socially recognized (Blaskó, Papadimitriou, & Manca, 2020). Playing a visible role in managing such difficult situation can increase the visibility and social status of those professions. Those outcomes are not yet determined but could very well lead to long-term changes in gender norms and stereotypes.

4.2   Conclusion

Rapid changes in women's social roles marked the end of the 20th century, which provoked many consequent changes to the way women are perceived. In many ways those changes are still taking place, albeit less dynamically, as seen through employment rates and patterns, policies, health outcomes etc. (Gender Equality Index, 2019). The goal of this work was to explore women's perspective on feminine gender norms and stereotypes, and how they compare to women's self-descriptions. In summary, there appears to be more support for maintenance of traditional feminine norms and stereotypes, despite increasing convergence of male and female social roles and behaviours, although the androgyny of women's self-ratings indicates some progress towards lesser gender dichotomy. Similarities between Poland and Portugal seem to advocate that this is a phenomenon surpassing cultural differences. Thus, this study shines some new light on the current state of gender perception in Europe. Particularly when issues of gender equality are often presented as outdated and it is believed that we might have moved towards a post-gender society, scientific exploration of the current social structure is necessary. Even more so when we face an unparalleled calamity that is bound to change our social order in ways that cannot be yet predicted.

REFERENCES

Abele, A. E., & Wojciszke, B. (2007). Agency and communion from the perspective of self versus others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 751–763. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.751

Allport, F.H. (1924). *Social Psychology*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Auster, C. J., & Ohm, S. C. (2000). Masculinity and femininity in contemporary American society: A reevaluation using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Sex roles*, *43*(7-8), 499-528.

Barker, G., Contreras, J. M., Heilman, B., Singh, A., Verma, R., & Nascimento, M. (2011). *Evolving Men: Initial results from the international Men and Gender Equality Survey (IMAGES)*. Washington, DC: International Center for Research on Women (ICRW).

Baron-Cohen, S. (2003). *The essential difference: The truth about the male and female brain*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bem, S. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162

Bem, S.L. (1981) Gender schema theory: a cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review*, 88:354.

Berenbaum, S. A., Blakemore, J. E. O., Beltz, A. M. (2011). A role for biology in gender related behavior. *Sex Roles*, 64:804-25.

Bianchi, S. M., Robinson, J. P., & Milkie, M.A. (2006). *Changing rhythms of American family life*. New York: Russell Sage.

Blakemore, J. E. O. (2003). Children's beliefs about violating gender norms: Boys shouldn't look like girls, and girls shouldn't act like boys. *Sex Roles*, 48:411-9.

Blaskó, Z., Papadimitriou, E., & Manca, A.R. (2020). *How will the COVID-19 crisis affect existing gender divides in Europe?*, EUR 30181 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, ISBN 978-92-76-18170-5, doi:10.2760/37511, JRC120525

Brinkman, R. L., & Brinkman, J. E. (1997). Cultural lag: conception and theory. *International Journal of Social Economics,* 24(6):609–627. doi:10.1108/03068299710179026

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S., & Vogel, S. R. (1970). Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 34:1–7. doi:10.1037/h0028797

Budrowska, B. (2004). Szklany sufit, czyli co blokuje kariery kobiet/Glass ceiling, or what is blocking women's careers. *Kultura i Historia*, *6*: 5-19.

Buss, D. M. (1997). Evolutionary foundations of personality. In R. Hogan (Ed.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 317-344). London, England: Academic Press.

Caneva, E. (2014). Children's agency and migration: Constructing kinship in Latin American and East European families living in Italy. *Childhood*, 22(2): 278–92.

Chan, W., McCrae, R., De Fruyt, F., Jussim, L., Löckenhoff, C. E., De Bolle, M., . . . Terracciano, A. (2012). Stereotypes of age differences in personality traits: Universal and accurate? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103:1050-1066.

Charles, M., & Grusky, D. B. (2004). *Occupational ghettos: The worldwide segregation of women and men*. Stanford, CA: Stanford university Press.

Chesters, J. (2010). Gender attitudes and housework: Trends over time in Australia. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 43(4):511–526.

Cislaghi, B. & Heise, L. (2020). Gender norms and social norms: differences, similarities and why they matter in prevention science. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 42(2):407-422.

Connell, R. (2014). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Connell, R. (2005). *Masculinities. 2nd ed*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Croft, A., Schmader, T., & Block, K. (2015). An underexamined inequality: Cultural and psychological barriers to men's engagement with communal roles. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 19:343–370. doi:10.1177/1088868314564789

Cuddy, A. J. C., Baily Wolf, E., Glick, P., Crotty, S., Chong, J., Norton, M. I. (2015). Men as cultural ideal: Cultural values moderate gender stereotype content. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109(4):622-635.

Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. L. (1983). Assessment of gender stereotypes: Methodology and components. *Psychological Documents*, 13:1–23.

Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. L. (1984). Structure of gender stereotypes: Interrelationships among components and gender label. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46:991–1004. doi:10. 1037/0022-3514.46.5.991

Diekman, A. B., & Eagly, A. H. (2000). Stereotypes as dynamic constructs: Women and men of the past, present, and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26:1171-1188. doi:10.1177/0146167200262001

Diekman, A. B., Eagly, A. H., & Johnston, A. M. (2010). Social structure. In J. F. Dovidio, M. Hewstone, P. G. Glick, & V. M. Esses (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 209–224). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. doi:10. 4135/9781446200919.n13

Durkheim, E. (1951). *Suicide : A study in sociology*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2016). Social role theory of sex differences. *The Wiley Blackwell encyclopedia of gender and sexuality studies*, 1-3.

Eagly, A.H. (1987) *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Eagly, H. A., & Stiffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(4):735-754.

Eickelkamp, U. (2011). Agency and structure in the life-world of aboriginal children in central Australia. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(4): 502–8.

Eisend, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of gender roles in advertising. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 38:418-40.

Elgström, O. (2000). Norm negotiations. The construction of new norms regarding gender and development in EU foreign aid policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 7(3):457–476.

England, P. (2010). The gender revolution: uneven and stalled. *Gender & Society*, 24(2): 149-66.

Equal Measures 2030 (2019). *Harnessing the power of data for gender equality: Introducing the 2019 EM2030 SDG Gender Index.*

European Institute of Gender Equality (2019). Gender Equality Index 2019 in brief: Still far from the finish line. Available at : https://eige.europa.eu/publications/gender-equality-index-2019-brief-still-far-finish-line#downloads-wrapper, accessed May 6th, 2020.

Ferrer-Pérez, V. A., & Bosch-Fiol, E. (2014). The measure of the masculinity–femininity construct today: Some reflections on the case of the Bem Sex Role Inventory/La medida del constructo masculinidad–feminidad en la actualidad: algunas reflexiones sobre el caso del Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Revista de psicología Social*, *29*(1): 180-207.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975*). Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research.* Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). What's so special about sex? Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Constanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society: Applied social psychology annual* (pp. 173-196). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fuller, N. J. Osores. (1997). Identidades masculinas: Varones de clase media en el Perú/ Masculine identities: Middle-class youth in Peru. Lima: *Universidad Pontificia Católica del Perú, Fondo Editorial*.

Gintis, H. (2010). Social norms as choreography. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics*, 9:251–64.

Godbole, M. A., Malvar, N. A., & Valian, V. V. (2019). Gender, modern sexism, and the 2016 election. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, 1–13. doi:10.1080/21565503.2019.1633934

Haines, E. L, Deaux, K., & Lofaro, N. (2016). The times they are a-changing… or are they not? A comparison of gender stereotypes, 1983-2014. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 40(3):353-363.

Hamilton, D. L., & Gifford, R. K. (1976). Illusory correlation in interpersonal perception: A cognitive basis of stereotypic judgments. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 12:392–407. doi:10.1016/S0022-1031(76)80006-6

Hayghe, H. (1990). Family members in the work force. *Monthly Labor Review*, 113(3):14-19.

Hentschel, T., Heilman, M. E., & Peus, C. V. (2019). The multiple dimensions of gender stereotypes: A current look at men's and women's characterizations of others and themselves. *Frontiers in psychology*, *10*:11.

Higgins, E. T., & Bargh, J. A. (1987). Social cognition and social perception. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38:369–425. doi:10. 1146/annurev.ps.38.020187.002101

Hines, M. (2011). Gender development and the human brain. *Annual Review of Neuroscience*, 34:69-88. doi:10.1146/annurev-neuro-061010-113654

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences* (2nd edition): Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Hornsey, M.J., Majkut, L., Terry, D.J. & McKimmie, B.M. (2003). On being loud and proud: non-conformity and counter-conformity to group norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42:319–35.

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (Eds.). (2004). *Culture, leadership, and organizations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies*. Sage publications.

Huber, J. (2007) *On the origins of Gender inequality*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60:581–592. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.60.6.581

Hyde, J.S. (2014). Gender similarities and differences. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65:373–98.

Iwanowska, M., Bitowt, J., Czarnowska, S., Damaske, M., Jurczyk, P., & Kraczek, K. (2017). Stereotypy płci na polskim YouTube/ Gender stereotypes on Polish Youtube. *Media-Biznes-Kultura. Dziennikarstwo i komunikacja spoleczna*, 2(3).

Jacob, S., Scherpereel, J. A., & Adams, M. (2014). Gender norms and women's political representation: A global analysis of cabinets, 1979–2009. *Governance*, *27*(2):321-345.

Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1987). The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behaviour. In E. E. Jones, D. E. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbett, S. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), *Attribution: Perceiving the Causes of Behavior*. Hillsdale (pp. 79-94). NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Kane, E. W. (2000). Racial and ethnic variations in gender-related attitudes. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26: 419–39.

Knoll, S., Eisend, M., & Steinhagen, J. (2011). Gender roles in advertising: Measuring and comparing gender stereotyping on public and private TV channels in Germany. *International Journal of Advertising*, 30(5): 867-88.

Legros, S., & Cislaghi, B. (2020). Mapping the social-norms literature: An overview of reviews. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15(1):62-80.

Lippa, R. A. (2010). Sex differences in personality traits and gender-related occupational preferences across 53 nations: Testing evolutionary and social-environmental theories. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39: 619-636. doi:10.1007/s10508-008-9380-7

Löckenhoff, C. E., Chan, W., McCrae, R. R., De Fruyt, F., Jussim, L., De Bolle, M., ... & Nakazato, K. (2014). Gender stereotypes of personality: Universal and accurate?. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45(5):675-694.

López-Sáez, J. M., Morales, F., & Lisbona, A (2008). Evolution of gender stereotypes in Spain: Traits and roles. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 11(2):609-617.

Lucier-Greer, M., & Adler-Baeder, F. (2011). An examination of gender role attitude change patterns among continuously married, divorced, and remarried individuals. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 52(4):225–243. doi:10.1080/10502556.2011.556977.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). *The making of men: Masculinities, sexualities and schooling*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Mahalik, J. R., Morray, E. B., Coonerty-Femiano, A., Ludlow, L. H., Slattery, S. M., & Smiler, A. (2005). Development of the conformity to feminine norms inventory. *Sex Roles*, 52(7-8):417-435.

Manganaro, L. L., & Alozie, N. O. (2011). Gender role attitudes: Who supports expanded rights for women in Afghanistan?. *Sex Roles*, 64(7–8): 516–29.

Marcus, R., Harper, C. (2014). *Gender justice and social norms-processes of change for adolescent girls*. London: Overseas Development Institute.

McDonald, P. (2013). Societal foundations for explaining fertility: Gender equity. *Demographic Research*, 28(34):981–994. doi:10.4054/DemRes.2013.28.34.

Olson, J.M., Roese, N.J., & Zanna, M.P. (1996). Expectancies. In E.T. Higgins & A.W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles* (pp. 211–238). New York: Guilford Press.

Parker, K., & Wang, W. (2013). Modern parenthood. *Pew Research Center's Social & Demographic Trends Project*, 14.

Pessin, L. (2017). Changing gender norms and marriage dynamics in the United States. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 80(1):25–41. doi:10.1111/jomf.12444

Prentice, D.A., & Miller, D.T. (2006). Essentializing differences between women and men, *Psychological Science*, 17:129–35.

Reskin, B. F., & Roos, P. A. (1990). *Job queues, gender queues: Explaining women's inroads into male occupations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Risman, B. (2018). *Where the millennials will take us: a new generation wrestles with the gender structure*. New York: Oxford university Press.

Risman, B. J. (2009). From doing to undoing: Gender as we know it. *Gender & Society*, 23:81-84.

Rothbart, M., & Park, B. (1986). On the confirmability and disconfirmability of trait concepts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50:131–142. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.50.1.131

Ruble, D. N., Martin, C. L., & Berenbaum, S. A. (2006). Gender development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 3, Social, emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., pp. 858-932). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2001). Prescriptive gender stereotypes and backlash toward agentic women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57:743–762. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00239

Schippers, M. (2007). Recovering the feminine other: Masculinity, femininity, and gender hegemony. *Theory and Society*, 36:85-102.

Schmitt, D. P., Realo, A., Voracek, M., & Allik, J. (2008). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Sex differences in Big Five personality traits across 55 cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94:168-182. doi:10.1037/a0014651

Schouten, M. J. (2017). *Undoing gender inequalities in Portugal: a long and winding road*. Paper presented at the Conference on Social Inequalities and Public Policies, in honour of Prof Manuel Carlos Silva, held at the University of Minho (Braga), October 4, 2017.

Seguino, S. (2007). PlusÇa Change? Evidence on global trends in gender norms and stereotypes. *Feminist Economics*, 13(2):1–28. doi:10.1080/13545700601184880

Sherif, M. (1936). *The psychology of social norms*. New York and London: Harper & brothers.

Slegh, H., & Kimonyo, A. (2010). *Masculinity and gender based violence in Rwanda: Experiences and perceptions of men and women*. Kigali, Rwanda: Rwanda Men's Resource Centre, Rwanda MenEngage Network

Smedley, J. W, & Bayton, J. A. (1978). Evaluative race and class stereotypes by race and perceived class of subjects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36:530- 535.

Snyder, M., Tanke, E. D., & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perception and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35:656–666. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.35.9.656

Sobotka, T. (2016). Understanding low fertility: Portugal in a European context. In V. Cunha (Ed.), *As problemáticas da natalidade em Portugal- Uma questão Social, Económica e Política (pp. 49-71)*. Lisboa: Imprensa de Ciências Sociais.

Soto, C. J., John, O. P., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2011). Age differences in personality traits from 10 to 65: Big five domains and facets in a large cross-sectional sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100:330-348. doi:10.1037/a0021717

Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972). The attitudes toward women scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *JSAS: Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 2:66–67 (Ms. 153).

Stangor, C., & McMillan, D. (1992). Memory for expectancy-congruent and expectancy-incongruent information: A review of the social and social developmental literatures. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111:42-61. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.111.1.42

Steil, J. M. (1997). *Marital equality: Its relationship to the well-being of husbands and wives.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Taylor, M.C., Hall, J.A. (1982). Psychological androgyny: Theories, methods, and conclusions. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92:347–366.

Templin, C. (1999). Hillary Clinton as threat to gender norms: Cartoon images of the first lady. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 23(1):20–36.

Tenenbaum, H.R., & Leaper, C. (2002). Are parents' gender schemas related to their children's gender related cognitions? A meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 38:615–30.

Valian, V. (1998). *Why so slow? The advancement of women*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

White, K. M., Smith, J. R., Terry, D. J., Greenslade, J. H., & McKimmie, B. M. (2009). Social influence in the theory of planned behaviour: The role of descriptive, injunctive, and in-group norms. *British journal of social psychology*, 48(1):135-158.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1982). *Measuring sex stereotypes: A thirty-nation study*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Sex and psyche: Gender and self viewed cross-culturally*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Williams, J.E., & Best, D.L. (1990). Measuring sex stereotyping: A multination study. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Witt, M.G., Wood, W. (2010). Self-regulation of behavior in everyday life. *Sex Roles*, 62:635–646. doi: 10.1007/s11199-010-9761-y.Wood et al., 1997

Wood, W., Eagly, A.H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 699–727.Salzman, 1999

Wood, W., Eagly, A.H. (2010). Gender. In S. Fiske, D. Gilbert, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 629–667). New York: Oxford University Press.

Wood, W., Eagly, A. H. (2009). Gender identity. In M. Leary & R. Hoyle (Eds), *Handbook of individual differences* (pp. 109–125). New York: Guilford Press.

Yu, C., Zuo, X., Blum, R. W., Tolman, D. L., Kågesten, A., Mmari, K., ... & Lian, Q. (2017). Marching to a different drummer: A cross-cultural comparison of young adolescents who challenge gender norms. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 61(4):48-54.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Participants' occupation type

Occupation classification	Total sample	
	n	%
Health professionals	**4**	**6.7**
Physiotherapist	1	
Doctor	2	
Medical assistant	1	
Education professionals	**18**	**30.0**
Higher education lecturers	2	
School teachers	6	
Language lectors	1	
Other educators	2	
Researchers	7	
Business and Administration professionals	**22**	**36.7**
Finance professionals	2	
Administration professionals	6	
Specialised Managers and Technicians	4	
Entrepreneur	5	
Office workers	5	
Legal professions	**2**	**3.3**
Lawyer	1	
Legal assistant	1	
Social and cultural professionals	**6**	**10.0**
Librarians	1	
Editors	2	
Social workers	1	
Psychologists	2	

Occupation classification	Total sample	
	n	%
Service and sales workers	**7**	**11.7**
Gastronomy	2	
Sales workers	1	
Child care workers	1	
Protective services workers	1	
Receptionist	2	
Engineering professionals	**1**	**1.7**
Engineers	1	
Total	**60**	**46.9**

Appendix B

Means and Standard Deviations of all personality traits

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Assertiveness									
Self-Rating	83	5,29	2,13	45	5,75	1,77	128	5,45	2,02
Desirability	83	5,02	2,27	45	6,04	2,25	128	5,38	2,31
Typicality	83	4,31	1,42	44	5,00	1,83	127	4,55	1,60
Cooperativeness									
Self-Rating	83	6,70	1,74	45	6,71	1,78	128	6,70	1,74
Desirability	83	7,48	1,64	45	7,27	1,76	128	7,41	1,68
Typicality	83	5,72	1,83	45	5,62	1,81	128	5,69	1,82
Sensitivity to Others									
Self-Rating	83	6,77	1,98	45	6,73	1,66	128	6,76	1,86
Desirability	83	7,67	1,58	45	7,27	1,75	128	7,53	1,64
Typicality	83	6,31	1,67	45	6,35	1,77	128	6,33	1,70
Arrogance									
Self-Rating	83	2,90	1,76	45	3,27	1,80	128	3,03	1,78
Desirability	83	1,57	,99	45	1,89	1,25	128	1,68	1,09
Typicality	83	4,11	1,69	45	3,80	1,69	128	4,00	1,69
Generosity									
Self-Rating	83	5,52	1,65	45	6,27	1,48	128	5,78	1,63
Desirability	83	6,71	1,79	45	7,09	1,77	128	6,84	1,78
Typicality	83	5,13	1,46	45	5,73	1,66	128	5,34	1,55
Laziness									
Self-Rating	83	4,71	2,28	45	4,13	2,20	128	4,51	2,26
Desirability	83	1,58	1,07	45	2,31	1,82	128	1,83	1,42
Typicality	83	4,16	1,68	45	3,60	1,85	128	3,96	1,76
Self-Esteem									
Self-Rating	83	5,48	2,26	45	5,44	2,03	128	5,47	2,18
Desirability	83	5,78	2,34	45	6,18	2,07	128	5,92	2,25

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Typicality	83	4,57	1,79	45	4,71	1,77	128	4,62	1,77
Optimism									
Self-Rating	83	5,34	2,48	45	6,02	1,68	128	5,58	2,25
Desirability	83	7,14	1,61	45	6,93	1,83	128	7,07	1,68
Typicality	83	4,65	1,47	45	4,89	1,63	128	4,73	1,52
Idealism									
Self-Rating	83	5,60	2,30	45	5,84	1,76	128	5,69	2,12
Desirability	83	5,18	1,81	45	5,11	2,37	128	5,16	2,02
Typicality	83	4,81	1,64	45	4,93	1,68	128	4,85	1,65
Cynicism									
Self-Rating	83	3,73	2,40	45	2,71	2,09	128	3,37	2,34
Desirability	83	1,84	1,15	45	2,04	1,43	128	1,91	1,25
Typicality	83	4,36	1,67	45	4,18	1,89	128	4,30	1,74
Adaptability									
Self-Rating	83	6,10	1,73	45	6,82	1,68	128	6,35	1,74
Desirability	83	7,79	1,50	45	7,11	1,60	128	7,55	1,56
Typicality	83	6,00	1,83	45	6,18	1,84	128	6,06	1,83
Stubbornness									
Self-Rating	83	6,49	1,68	45	6,11	1,93	128	6,36	1,78
Desirability	83	3,94	2,00	45	3,40	2,01	128	3,75	2,01
Typicality	83	5,63	1,74	45	5,29	1,84	128	5,50	1,77
Happiness									
Self-Rating	83	5,22	2,22	45	5,95	1,89	128	5,48	2,14
Desirability	83	7,72	1,47	45	6,26	2,20	128	7,21	1,88
Typicality	83	4,73	1,36	45	4,64	1,68	128	4,70	1,48
Life Satisfaction									
Self-Rating	83	5,57	2,23	45	5,89	1,82	128	5,68	2,09
Desirability	83	7,46	1,68	45	6,53	1,98	128	7,13	1,84
Typicality	82	4,28	1,44	45	4,49	1,67	127	4,35	1,52
Politeness									
Self-Rating	83	6,97	1,58	45	6,29	1,71	128	6,73	1,66

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Desirability	83	8,18	1,27	45	7,09	1,66	128	7,80	1,51
Typicality	83	5,46	1,65	45	5,49	1,65	128	5,47	1,64
Extroversion									
Self-Rating	82	4,18	2,28	45	5,42	2,13	127	4,62	2,29
Desirability	82	5,34	2,05	45	5,20	1,80	127	5,29	1,96
Typicality	82	5,04	1,10	45	5,11	1,69	127	5,06	1,34
Cheerfulness									
Self-Rating	83	5,52	2,23	45	6,07	1,80	128	5,71	2,10
Desirability	83	7,67	1,48	45	6,60	1,99	128	7,30	1,75
Typicality	83	4,96	1,36	45	5,22	1,43	128	5,05	1,39
Friendliness									
Self-Rating	83	6,97	1,46	45	6,18	1,73	128	6,69	1,60
Desirability	82	8,04	1,39	45	7,09	1,69	127	7,70	1,56
Typicality	83	5,35	1,59	45	5,93	1,80	128	5,55	1,68
Decisiveness									
Self-Rating	83	6,05	2,11	45	5,91	2,04	128	6,00	2,08
Desirability	83	5,96	2,24	45	5,42	2,41	128	5,77	2,30
Typicality	83	5,32	1,60	45	5,07	1,59	128	5,23	1,59
Dependability									
Self-Rating	83	7,25	1,47	44	7,02	1,50	127	7,17	1,48
Desirability	83	7,13	1,92	45	7,20	1,73	128	7,16	1,85
Typicality	83	5,14	1,41	45	5,49	1,74	128	5,26	1,54
Forgetfulness									
Self-Rating	83	4,14	2,33	45	5,00	2,32	128	4,44	2,35
Desirability	83	2,13	1,50	45	2,87	2,07	128	2,39	1,75
Typicality	82	4,50	1,54	45	4,55	1,90	127	4,52	1,67
Loyalty									
Self-Rating	83	7,53	1,51	45	7,20	1,47	128	7,41	1,50
Desirability	83	8,14	1,49	45	7,44	1,73	128	7,90	1,61
Typicality	83	5,41	1,56	45	5,53	1,66	128	5,45	1,59
Impressionability									

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Self-Rating	83	4,32	1,79	45	4,93	1,57	128	4,54	1,73
Desirability	83	5,35	2,52	45	5,27	2,08	128	5,32	2,37
Typicality	83	5,59	1,33	45	4,93	1,53	128	5,36	1,43
Strength of Personality									
Self-Rating	83	6,20	2,12	45	6,60	1,78	128	6,34	2,01
Desirability	83	4,72	2,43	45	4,80	2,62	128	4,75	2,49
Typicality	83	5,42	1,55	44	5,32	1,68	127	5,38	1,59
Spirituality									
Self-Rating	83	4,66	2,54	45	4,98	2,41	128	4,77	2,49
Desirability	83	6,12	2,18	45	5,40	2,26	128	5,87	2,23
Typicality	83	5,12	1,53	45	5,58	1,86	128	5,28	1,66
Superstitiousness									
Self-Rating	83	2,71	1,84	45	2,95	2,13	128	2,80	1,94
Desirability	83	2,72	1,74	45	2,98	1,85	128	2,81	1,78
Typicality	83	5,04	1,70	45	5,15	1,84	128	5,08	1,75
Gullibility									
Self-Rating	83	3,97	2,01	45	4,24	2,33	128	4,07	2,12
Desirability	83	3,79	2,49	45	4,58	2,35	128	4,07	2,46
Typicality	83	5,26	1,71	45	5,11	1,77	128	5,21	1,73
Religiousness									
Self-Rating	83	3,38	2,63	45	3,13	2,49	128	3,30	2,57
Desirability	83	5,78	2,28	45	5,02	2,26	128	5,51	2,29
Typicality	83	5,42	1,68	45	5,09	1,79	128	5,30	1,72
Self-Criticism									
Self-Rating	83	6,78	1,75	45	6,58	1,91	128	6,71	1,80
Desirability	83	5,70	1,85	45	5,51	2,22	128	5,63	1,98
Typicality	83	5,91	2,14	45	5,13	1,70	128	5,64	2,03
Anxiety									
Self-Rating	83	4,35	2,34	45	5,64	2,33	128	4,80	2,41
Desirability	83	2,26	1,61	45	2,91	1,93	128	2,49	1,75
Typicality	83	4,61	1,49	45	5,87	1,56	128	5,05	1,62

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Self-Reliance									
Self-Rating	82	7,03	1,69	45	5,42	1,94	127	6,46	1,94
Desirability	82	6,24	2,31	45	5,64	2,27	127	6,03	2,30
Typicality	82	5,99	1,85	45	4,75	1,51	127	5,55	1,83
Ambitiousness									
Self-Rating	83	6,69	1,89	45	6,07	1,54	128	6,47	1,79
Desirability	83	5,71	2,22	45	5,15	2,25	128	5,51	2,24
Typicality	83	5,82	1,61	45	5,31	1,84	128	5,64	1,70
Sense of Humour									
Self-Rating	83	6,67	1,74	45	6,27	1,85	128	6,53	1,78
Desirability	83	6,73	1,87	45	6,02	2,03	128	6,48	1,95
Typicality	82	5,41	1,45	45	5,09	1,63	127	5,30	1,52
Intelligence									
Self-Rating	83	7,17	1,40	45	6,53	1,53	128	6,94	1,47
Desirability	83	6,20	2,32	45	6,15	2,30	128	6,19	2,31
Typicality	82	5,71	1,64	45	5,75	1,87	127	5,72	1,72
Warmth & Kindness									
Self-Rating	83	6,75	1,61	45	6,55	1,42	128	6,68	1,55
Desirability	83	8,26	1,22	45	7,18	1,76	128	7,88	1,52
Typicality	83	5,69	1,40	45	5,84	1,76	128	5,74	1,53
Intensity									
Self-Rating	82	5,72	1,99	45	6,15	1,88	127	5,87	1,96
Desirability	82	5,13	1,85	45	4,33	2,26	127	4,85	2,03
Typicality	82	5,15	1,38	45	5,42	1,72	127	5,24	1,51
Solemnity									
Self-Rating	83	5,51	1,87	45	4,55	1,84	128	5,17	1,91
Desirability	83	5,59	1,86	45	5,24	2,07	128	5,47	1,93
Typicality	83	5,31	1,48	45	4,82	1,57	128	5,14	1,52
Cleverness									
Self-Rating	83	6,47	1,64	45	5,71	1,60	128	6,20	1,66
Desirability	83	6,35	2,10	45	5,49	2,23	128	6,05	2,18

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Typicality	82	5,63	1,42	45	5,60	1,79	127	5,62	1,55
Interestingness									
Self-Rating	83	5,41	1,88	45	5,89	1,54	128	5,58	1,78
Desirability	83	6,70	1,78	45	6,35	2,09	128	6,58	1,89
Typicality	83	5,46	1,43	45	5,58	1,71	128	5,50	1,53
Business Sense									
Self-Rating	82	3,86	2,23	45	4,38	1,81	127	4,05	2,10
Desirability	83	5,19	2,40	45	5,29	2,40	128	5,23	2,39
Typicality	83	5,19	1,73	45	5,07	1,61	128	5,15	1,69
Rationality									
Self-Rating	83	6,88	1,68	45	6,44	1,90	128	6,73	1,77
Desirability	83	6,23	2,21	45	5,71	2,40	128	6,05	2,29
Typicality	83	5,40	1,64	45	5,09	1,74	128	5,29	1,67
Creativity									
Self-Rating	82	6,38	1,89	45	5,84	1,84	127	6,19	1,88
Desirability	82	6,58	1,84	45	5,84	2,24	127	6,32	2,02
Typicality	82	5,73	1,50	45	5,71	1,75	127	5,72	1,59
Yielding									
Self-Rating	83	3,55	1,97	44	2,59	2,00	127	3,22	2,03
Desirability	83	6,37	2,48	44	4,64	2,86	127	5,77	2,74
Typicality	83	5,18	1,66	44	4,73	1,77	127	5,02	1,71
Self-Awareness									
Self-Rating	82	7,13	1,45	45	6,71	1,49	127	6,98	1,47
Desirability	82	5,47	2,31	45	5,84	2,49	127	5,61	2,37
Typicality	82	5,26	1,55	45	5,42	1,68	127	5,31	1,60
Wholesomeness									
Self-Rating	83	5,96	1,62	44	5,84	1,76	127	5,92	1,66
Desirability	83	6,93	1,91	44	5,93	1,87	127	6,58	1,95
Typicality	83	5,16	1,31	44	5,43	1,73	127	5,25	1,47
Literary Capacity									
Self-Rating	81	5,18	2,44	45	6,47	1,86	126	5,64	2,33

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Desirability	81	4,46	2,20	45	5,91	2,34	126	4,98	2,35
Typicality	81	4,36	1,73	45	5,47	1,88	126	4,75	1,85
Worldliness									
Self-Rating	82	4,77	2,25	45	6,07	1,68	127	5,23	2,15
Desirability	82	5,16	2,17	45	5,84	2,34	127	5,40	2,25
Typicality	82	4,89	1,49	44	4,84	1,64	126	4,87	1,54
Shyness									
Self-Rating	82	4,35	2,25	45	4,18	2,07	127	4,29	2,18
Desirability	82	4,28	2,35	45	4,60	2,04	127	4,39	2,24
Typicality	81	4,57	1,39	45	4,24	1,58	126	4,45	1,47
Naivete									
Self-Rating	82	3,84	1,92	45	3,78	2,05	127	3,82	1,96
Desirability	82	4,27	2,44	45	4,38	2,24	127	4,31	2,36
Typicality	82	4,82	1,59	45	4,51	1,73	127	4,71	1,64
Controlling									
Self-Rating	82	5,43	2,31	45	5,64	1,75	127	5,50	2,12
Desirability	82	4,01	2,27	44	5,66	2,49	126	4,59	2,47
Typicality	82	5,68	1,67	45	5,20	1,55	127	5,51	1,64
Concern for Future									
Self-Rating	82	6,52	2,01	45	6,91	1,61	127	6,66	1,88
Desirability	81	5,02	2,14	45	6,33	1,98	126	5,49	2,17
Typicality	82	6,30	1,70	45	6,31	2,00	127	6,31	1,81
Patience									
Self-Rating	82	5,34	2,12	45	5,09	2,21	127	5,25	2,15
Desirability	82	7,78	1,47	45	7,13	1,71	127	7,55	1,59
Typicality	82	5,36	1,43	45	5,58	1,94	127	5,44	1,62
Self-Righteousness									
Self-Rating	82	6,13	1,76	44	3,11	1,66	126	5,08	2,25
Desirability	82	4,16	2,00	44	2,54	1,47	126	3,59	1,98
Typicality	82	5,62	1,80	44	3,73	1,67	126	4,96	1,97
Maturity									

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Self-Rating	82	6,58	1,67	45	6,60	1,44	127	6,59	1,58
Desirability	82	7,52	1,63	45	7,15	1,86	127	7,39	1,71
Typicality	82	5,77	1,63	45	5,87	1,71	127	5,80	1,65
Excitability									
Self-Rating	82	4,45	2,15	44	4,86	2,17	126	4,59	2,16
Desirability	82	3,13	1,65	44	4,07	2,23	126	3,46	1,92
Typicality	82	4,86	1,45	44	4,68	1,60	126	4,80	1,50
Melodramatic Tendency									
Self-Rating	82	3,82	2,12	45	3,33	2,10	127	3,64	2,12
Desirability	82	3,04	2,29	45	2,33	1,36	127	2,79	2,04
Typicality	81	5,32	1,78	45	4,98	1,39	126	5,20	1,65
Willing to Take Risks									
Self-Rating	82	3,90	2,14	45	5,20	2,19	127	4,36	2,24
Desirability	82	4,21	1,78	45	4,82	2,27	127	4,42	1,98
Typicality	81	4,38	1,48	45	4,55	1,79	126	4,44	1,59
Approval Seeking									
Self-Rating	82	5,41	2,10	43	4,49	2,17	125	5,10	2,16
Desirability	82	4,62	2,21	43	4,44	2,29	125	4,56	2,23
Typicality	82	6,44	1,64	42	5,26	1,81	124	6,04	1,78
Athleticism									
Self-Rating	82	4,69	2,00	45	4,29	2,42	127	4,55	2,15
Desirability	82	6,83	1,99	45	6,11	2,26	127	6,57	2,11
Typicality	82	4,94	1,32	45	4,42	1,80	127	4,75	1,53
Enthusiasm									
Self-Rating	82	5,23	1,99	45	5,95	1,72	127	5,49	1,93
Desirability	82	6,77	1,70	45	6,00	2,08	127	6,50	1,87
Typicality	82	5,34	1,39	45	5,38	1,75	127	5,35	1,52
Nosiness									
Self-Rating	82	2,93	1,94	45	2,49	1,67	127	2,77	1,86
Desirability	82	2,40	1,98	45	2,13	1,32	127	2,31	1,77
Typicality	81	5,74	1,74	45	4,87	1,88	126	5,43	1,83

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Playfulness									
Self-Rating	82	6,16	1,95	44	5,84	1,64	126	6,05	1,84
Desirability	82	5,94	2,01	44	5,23	1,87	126	5,69	1,98
Typicality	82	5,28	1,37	44	5,11	1,64	126	5,22	1,47
Being Principled									
Self-Rating	82	5,79	1,82	45	7,44	1,60	127	6,38	1,91
Desirability	81	4,95	1,84	45	7,27	1,96	126	5,78	2,18
Typicality	81	4,80	1,40	45	6,20	1,89	126	5,30	1,72
Conservatism									
Self-Rating	82	3,08	2,17	45	2,73	1,89	127	2,96	2,07
Desirability	82	5,50	2,31	45	4,69	2,18	127	5,21	2,29
Typicality	82	4,89	1,53	45	4,58	1,66	127	4,78	1,58
Typicality									
Self-Rating	82	4,62	2,14	44	3,84	1,75	126	4,35	2,04
Desirability	82	4,16	2,26	45	5,35	2,05	127	4,58	2,25
Typicality	82	5,26	1,60	45	5,07	1,56	127	5,19	1,58
Centre of Attention									
Self-Rating	82	3,82	2,17	45	3,00	1,78	127	3,53	2,07
Desirability	82	3,74	1,82	45	2,75	1,64	127	3,39	1,81
Typicality	82	5,33	1,62	45	4,27	1,80	127	4,95	1,75
Rebelliousness									
Self-Rating	82	4,96	2,16	45	5,02	2,10	127	4,98	2,13
Desirability	82	2,79	1,98	45	3,31	1,82	127	2,98	1,94
Typicality	82	4,74	1,51	45	4,15	1,70	127	4,53	1,60
Secretiveness									
Self-Rating	82	5,40	2,32	45	4,47	1,70	127	5,07	2,16
Desirability	82	4,79	1,84	45	4,71	2,08	127	4,76	1,92
Typicality	82	4,67	1,43	45	4,42	1,62	127	4,58	1,50
Mischievousness									
Self-Rating	82	3,91	2,36	43	3,30	1,64	125	3,70	2,15
Desirability	82	5,71	2,01	44	3,14	1,66	126	4,81	2,26

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Typicality	82	5,00	1,51	44	3,59	1,43	126	4,51	1,62
Honesty									
Self-Rating	82	7,36	1,48	45	7,22	1,44	127	7,31	1,46
Desirability	82	7,86	1,55	45	7,09	1,70	127	7,59	1,64
Typicality	81	5,69	1,22	45	5,44	1,98	126	5,60	1,53
Flirtatiousness									
Self-Rating	82	3,50	2,25	44	3,45	2,24	126	3,48	2,24
Desirability	82	6,33	2,05	44	4,32	2,40	126	5,63	2,37
Typicality	82	5,79	1,50	44	4,77	1,79	126	5,44	1,67
Choosy									
Self-Rating	82	4,90	2,07	45	5,22	1,99	127	5,01	2,04
Desirability	82	3,17	1,95	45	3,82	2,23	127	3,40	2,07
Typicality	82	5,47	1,47	45	4,80	1,67	127	5,24	1,57
Open Mindedness									
Self-Rating	82	7,08	1,76	45	7,24	1,49	127	7,14	1,66
Desirability	82	5,58	2,26	45	6,22	2,24	127	5,81	2,27
Typicality	82	5,19	1,60	45	5,13	1,99	127	5,17	1,74
Cleanliness									
Self-Rating	82	6,61	1,84	45	6,38	1,89	127	6,53	1,85
Desirability	82	8,10	1,31	45	7,55	1,63	127	7,90	1,45
Typicality	82	6,16	1,48	45	6,27	1,66	127	6,20	1,54
Perfectionism									
Self-Rating	82	6,22	2,05	45	6,11	1,90	127	6,18	1,99
Desirability	82	6,68	2,02	45	6,18	1,87	127	6,50	1,98
Typicality	82	5,50	1,46	45	5,31	1,58	127	5,43	1,50
Discipline									
Self-Rating	82	6,05	2,09	45	5,93	1,84	127	6,01	2,00
Desirability	82	7,39	1,56	45	6,84	1,84	127	7,20	1,68
Typicality	82	5,38	1,37	45	5,73	1,66	127	5,50	1,48

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Common Sense									
Self-Rating	82	7,06	1,44	44	6,65	1,51	126	6,92	1,47
Desirability	82	7,33	1,90	44	6,61	2,01	126	7,08	1,96
Typicality	81	5,60	1,47	44	5,84	2,06	125	5,69	1,70
Prejudiced									
Self-Rating	82	2,83	1,63	44	2,36	1,66	126	2,67	1,65
Desirability	82	2,91	1,91	43	2,63	2,13	125	2,82	1,98
Typicality	81	4,70	1,38	44	4,59	1,62	125	4,66	1,46
Helpfulness									
Self-Rating	82	6,30	1,67	45	6,71	1,47	127	6,45	1,61
Desirability	82	7,77	1,61	45	7,27	1,81	127	7,59	1,70
Typicality	82	5,72	1,42	45	6,18	1,86	127	5,88	1,60
Defends Own Beliefs									
Self-Rating	82	6,78	1,65	45	6,55	1,84	127	6,70	1,72
Desirability	82	4,66	2,35	45	5,20	2,53	127	4,85	2,42
Typicality	82	5,57	1,55	45	5,51	2,04	127	5,55	1,73
Being Materialistic									
Self-Rating	82	3,85	2,08	44	3,45	1,82	126	3,71	1,99
Desirability	82	3,11	2,00	44	3,45	1,92	126	3,23	1,97
Typicality	81	5,85	1,44	44	5,00	1,75	125	5,55	1,60
Jealous Tendency									
Self-Rating	82	4,22	2,17	45	3,60	2,17	127	4,00	2,18
Desirability	82	3,34	2,07	45	3,11	1,80	127	3,26	1,97
Typicality	82	6,04	1,53	45	5,44	1,53	127	5,83	1,55
Interest in Children									
Self-Rating	82	4,72	2,88	45	5,69	2,34	127	5,06	2,73
Desirability	82	7,60	1,97	45	7,07	1,96	127	7,41	1,98
Typicality	82	6,38	1,64	44	6,48	1,77	126	6,41	1,68

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Efficiency									
Self-Rating	82	6,02	1,73	44	6,50	1,58	126	6,19	1,69
Desirability	82	7,06	1,80	44	7,29	1,62	126	7,14	1,74
Typicality	82	5,54	1,58	44	6,11	1,66	126	5,74	1,62
Moodiness									
Self-Rating	82	4,73	2,28	45	4,29	2,19	127	4,57	2,25
Desirability	81	2,59	2,05	45	2,11	1,42	126	2,42	1,86
Typicality	82	5,65	1,59	45	4,38	1,75	127	5,20	1,75
Emotionality									
Self-Rating	82	6,28	2,22	45	5,89	2,00	127	6,14	2,14
Desirability	82	5,35	2,16	45	5,29	2,17	127	5,33	2,16
Typicality	82	6,33	1,49	45	6,29	1,55	127	6,31	1,50
Emotional Expression									
Self-Rating	82	5,35	2,40	45	5,78	2,20	127	5,50	2,33
Desirability	82	6,44	1,98	45	6,18	2,09	127	6,35	2,01
Typicality	82	5,67	1,42	45	5,84	1,99	127	5,73	1,64
Consistency									
Self-Rating	82	6,11	1,78	44	6,20	1,61	126	6,14	1,72
Desirability	82	6,88	1,79	44	6,82	1,66	126	6,85	1,74
Typicality	82	5,19	1,19	44	5,50	1,63	126	5,30	1,36
Attention to Appearances									
Self-Rating	82	4,47	2,15	45	4,11	1,96	127	4,35	2,08
Desirability	82	6,40	2,15	44	4,41	2,19	126	5,71	2,36
Typicality	82	6,68	1,50	45	5,80	1,89	127	6,37	1,69
Persuasiveness									
Self-Rating	82	5,34	2,06	44	5,09	1,71	126	5,25	1,94
Desirability	82	4,77	2,47	44	5,07	2,13	126	4,87	2,35
Typicality	81	5,09	1,49	44	5,09	1,29	125	5,09	1,42

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Sexual Promiscuity									
Self-Rating	82	4,15	2,42	44	2,89	2,15	126	3,71	2,40
Desirability	82	3,76	2,56	44	2,20	1,87	126	3,21	2,45
Typicality	81	4,80	1,50	44	3,54	1,90	125	4,36	1,75
Childlike									
Self-Rating	82	2,80	1,87	45	2,80	1,92	127	2,80	1,88
Desirability	82	2,94	2,04	45	1,93	1,27	127	2,58	1,87
Typicality	82	3,52	1,42	45	2,95	1,69	127	3,32	1,54
Weakness									
Self-Rating	81	3,57	1,67	45	2,95	1,35	126	3,35	1,59
Desirability	81	4,10	2,63	45	3,11	2,18	126	3,75	2,52
Typicality	81	4,22	1,47	45	3,64	1,55	126	4,01	1,52
Aggressiveness									
Self-Rating	82	2,91	2,04	45	3,00	1,89	127	2,94	1,98
Desirability	82	1,49	,91	45	1,49	,81	127	1,49	,87
Typicality	82	4,04	1,44	45	3,15	1,79	127	3,72	1,63
Stinginess									
Self-Rating	82	3,49	1,99	44	1,93	1,34	126	2,94	1,94
Desirability	82	2,43	1,47	44	1,79	1,30	126	2,21	1,44
Typicality	81	4,25	1,39	44	3,50	1,44	125	3,98	1,45
Broad Interests									
Self-Rating	82	6,38	1,93	44	6,48	1,37	126	6,41	1,75
Desirability	82	6,02	2,14	44	6,16	2,08	126	6,07	2,11
Typicality	82	5,21	1,54	44	5,20	1,89	126	5,21	1,66
Complicated									
Self-Rating	82	5,65	2,32	45	4,62	2,17	127	5,28	2,31
Desirability	82	2,97	1,96	44	2,75	1,79	126	2,90	1,90
Typicality	82	5,00	1,84	45	5,24	1,57	127	5,09	1,74

Trait	PL			PT			Total Sample		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Competitiveness									
Self-Rating	82	4,05	2,08	44	5,00	2,00	126	4,38	2,10
Desirability	82	4,33	2,30	44	4,59	1,98	126	4,42	2,19
Typicality	82	5,01	1,45	44	5,07	1,86	126	5,03	1,60
Leadership Ability									
Self-Rating	82	4,88	2,52	44	5,68	1,47	126	5,16	2,23
Desirability	82	4,23	2,29	44	5,39	2,51	126	4,63	2,42
Typicality	82	4,97	1,65	44	5,14	2,06	126	5,03	1,80
Forcefulness									
Self-Rating	81	4,09	2,18	45	6,33	1,65	126	4,89	2,27
Desirability	81	3,22	1,97	45	5,91	2,30	126	4,18	2,45
Typicality	81	4,84	1,45	45	5,91	2,01	126	5,22	1,74

Note. N= number of participants, M= mean score, SD= Standard Deviation.

Appendix C

Independent samples t-test for all personality traits

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Assertiveness									
Self-Rating	45	5.75	83	5.29	3.451	.066	1.251	126	.213
Desirability	45	6.04	83	5.02	.190	.663	2.434	126	.016
Typicality	44	5.00	83	4.31	2.873	.093	2.339	125	.021
Cooperativeness									
Self-Rating	45	6.71	83	6.70	.361	.549	.038	126	.970
Desirability	45	7.27	83	7.48	1.152	.285	-.690	126	.491
Typicality	45	5.62	83	5.72	.001	.973	-.298	126	.766
Sensitivity to Others									
Self-Rating	45	6.73	83	6.77	1.775	.185	-.109	126	.913
Desirability	45	7.27	83	7.67	3.444	.066	-1.344	126	.181
Typicality	45	6.35	83	6.31	.930	.337	.134	126	.894
Arrogance									
Self-Rating	45	3.27	83	2.90	.650	.422	1.103	126	.272
Desirability	45	1.89	83	1.57	6.103	.015	1.498	74.535	.138
Typicality	45	3.80	83	4.11	.052	.819	-.987	126	.326
Generosity									
Self-Rating	45	6.27	83	5.52	.165	.685	2.531	126	.013*
Desirability	45	7.09	83	6.71	.182	.671	1.145	126	.254
Typicality	45	5.73	83	5.13	1.469	.228	2.116	126	.036
Laziness									
Self-Rating	45	4.13	83	4.71	.405	.526	-1.384	126	.169
Desirability	45	2.31	83	1.58	17.398	.000	2.479	60.965	.016
Typicality	45	3.60	83	4.16	.908	.342	-1.723	126	.087
Self-Esteem									
Self-Rating	45	5.44	83	5.48	2.076	.152	-.093	126	.926
Desirability	45	6.18	83	5.78	1.018	.315	.948	126	.345
Typicality	45	4.71	83	4.57	.085	.772	.439	126	.661

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Optimism									
Self-Rating	45	6.02	83	5.34	12.963	.000	1.849	119.556	.067
Desirability	45	6.93	83	7.14	1.018	.315	-.676	126	.500
Typicality	45	4.89	83	4.65	.029	.866	.844	126	.400
Idealism									
Self-Rating	45	5.84	83	5.60	6.884	.010	.664	112.062	.508
Desirability	45	5.11	83	5.18	5.150	.025	-.172	72.592	.864
Typicality	45	4.93	83	4.81	.053	.818	.411	126	.682
Cynicism									
Self-Rating	45	2.71	83	3.73	3.104	.081	-2.403	126	.018
Desirability	45	2.04	83	1.84	3.153	.078	.865	126	.389
Typicality	45	4.18	83	4.36	.826	.365	-.567	126	.572
Adaptability									
Self-Rating	45	6.82	83	6.10	.003	.959	2.289	126	.024
Desirability	45	7.11	83	7.79	1.722	.192	-2.411	126	.017
Typicality	45	6.18	83	6.00	.587	.445	.524	126	.601
Stubbornness									
Self-Rating	45	6.11	83	6.49	.677	.412	-1.165	126	.246
Desirability	45	3.40	83	3.94	.028	.867	-1.453	126	.149
Typicality	45	5.29	83	5.63	.316	.575	-1.028	126	.306
Happiness									
Self-Rating	45	5.95	83	5.22	1.282	.260	1.886	126	.062
Desirability	45	6.27	83	7.72	11.829	.001	-3.987	65.757	.000**
Typicality	45	4.64	83	4.73	3.233	.075	-.330	126	.742
Life Satisfaction									
Self-Rating	45	5.89	83	5.57	2.007	.159	.832	126	.407
Desirability	45	6.53	83	7.46	4.321	.040	-2.654	78.377	.010*
Typicality	45	4.49	82	4.28	1.172	.281	.735	125	.464
Politeness									
Self-Rating	45	6.29	83	6.97	1.242	.267	-2.275	126	.025
Desirability	45	7.09	83	8.18	10.960	.001	-3.839	72.359	.000**

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Typicality	45	5.49	83	5.46	.050	.823	.102	126	.919
Extroversion									
Self-Rating	45	5.42	82	4.18	.228	.634	3.001	125	.003**
Desirability	45	5.20	82	5.34	.835	.363	-.388	125	.699
Typicality	45	5.11	82	5.04	10.376	.002	.266	64.989	.791
Cheerfulness									
Self-Rating	45	6.07	83	5.52	2.312	.131	1.416	126	.159
Desirability	45	6.60	83	7.67	6.909	.010	-3.459	126	.001**
Typicality	45	5.22	83	4.96	.196	.659	1.006	126	.317
Friendliness									
Self-Rating	45	6.18	83	6.97	4.705	.032	-2.624	77.910	.010*
Desirability	45	7.09	82	8.04	9.580	.002	-3.212	77.054	.002**
Typicality	45	5.93	83	5.35	2.052	.154	1.893	126	.061
Decisiveness									
Self-Rating	45	5.91	83	6.05	.000	.997	-.355	126	.723
Desirability	45	5.42	83	5.96	.755	.387	-1.273	126	.205
Typicality	45	5.07	83	5.32	.097	.756	-.875	126	.383
Dependability									
Self-Rating	44	7.02	83	7.25	.016	.900	-.833	125	.406
Desirability	45	7.20	83	7.13	.003	.959	.197	126	.844
Typicality	45	5.49	83	5.14	4.755	.031	1.139	75.977	.258
Forgetfulness									
Self-Rating	45	5.00	83	4.14	.038	.846	1.986	126	.049
Desirability	45	2.87	83	2.13	8.896	.003	2.095	69.646	.040*
Typicality	45	4.55	82	4.50	4.166	.043	.168	76.085	.867
Loyalty									
Self-Rating	45	7.20	83	7.53	.200	.655	-1.192	126	.235
Desirability	45	7.44	83	8.14	8.763	.004	-2.296	79.784	.024*
Typicality	45	5.53	83	5.41	.402	.527	.418	126	.676
Impressionability									
Self-Rating	45	4.93	83	4.32	1.599	.208	1.914	126	.058

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Desirability	45	5.27	83	5.35	5.744	.018	-.199	105.979	.843
Typicality	45	4.93	83	5.59	.414	.521	-2.525	126	.013*
Strength of Personality									
Self-Rating	45	6.60	83	6.20	1.309	.255	1.063	126	.290
Desirability	45	4.80	83	4.72	.052	.819	.167	126	.868
Typicality	44	5.32	83	5.42	.838	.362	-.348	125	.728
Spirituality									
Self-Rating	45	4.98	83	4.66	.575	.450	.683	126	.496
Desirability	45	5.40	83	6.12	.103	.749	-1.761	126	.081
Typicality	45	5.58	83	5.12	5.802	.017	1.407	76.650	.163
Superstitiousness									
Self-Rating	45	2.95	83	2.71	.991	.321	.678	126	.499
Desirability	45	2.98	83	2.72	.008	.927	.773	126	.441
Typicality	45	5.15	83	5.04	1.149	.286	.368	126	.713
Gullibility									
Self-Rating	45	4.24	83	3.97	1.001	.319	.682	126	.497
Desirability	45	4.58	83	3.79	.698	.405	1.730	126	.086
Typicality	45	5.11	83	5.26	.012	.914	-.480	126	.632
Religiousness									
Self-Rating	45	3.13	83	3.38	.367	.546	-.528	126	.598
Desirability	45	5.02	83	5.78	.146	.703	-1.808	126	.073
Typicality	45	5.09	83	5.42	.111	.739	-1.044	126	.299
Self-Criticism									
Self-Rating	45	6.58	83	6.78	.516	.474	-.614	126	.540
Desirability	45	5.51	83	5.70	5.014	.027	-.483	77.512	.631
Typicality	45	5.13	83	5.91	4.261	.041	-2.263	109.015	.026*
Anxiety									
Self-Rating	45	5.64	83	4.35	.019	.890	2.996	126	.003**
Desirability	45	2.91	83	2.26	1.165	.283	2.021	126	.045*
Typicality	45	5.87	83	4.61	.221	.639	4.467	126	.000**
Self-Reliance									

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	45	5.42	82	7.04	1.737	.190	-4.878	125	.000**
Desirability	45	5.64	82	6.24	.098	.755	-1.409	125	.161
Typicality	45	4.75	82	5.99	2.969	.087	-3.813	125	.000**
Ambitiousness									
Self-Rating	45	6.07	83	6.69	2.383	.125	-1.888	126	.061
Desirability	45	5.15	83	5.71	.064	.801	-1.343	126	.182
Typicality	45	5.31	83	5.82	1.053	.307	-1.620	126	.108
Sense of Humour									
Self-Rating	45	6.27	83	6.67	1.172	.281	-1.239	126	.218
Desirability	45	6.02	83	6.73	.077	.782	-1.999	126	.048*
Typicality	45	5.09	82	5.41	.583	.447	-1.158	125	.249
Intelligence									
Self-Rating	45	6.53	83	7.17	1.697	.195	-2.367	126	.019*
Desirability	45	6.15	83	6.20	.009	.924	-115	126	.909
Typicality	45	5.75	82	5.71	3.099	.081	.150	125	.881
Warmth & Kindness									
Self-Rating	45	6.55	83	6.75	.490	.485	-.667	126	.506
Desirability	45	7.18	83	8.26	21.867	.000	-3.688	67.429	.000**
Typicality	45	5.84	83	5.69	6.617	.011	.520	74.578	.605
Intensity									
Self-Rating	45	6.15	82	5.72	.033	.857	1.201	125	.232
Desirability	45	4.33	82	5.13	3.007	.085	-2.155	125	.033*
Typicality	45	5.42	82	5.15	5.325	.023	.923	75.276	.359
Solemnity									
Self-Rating	45	4.55	83	5.51	.161	.689	-2.761	126	.007**
Desirability	45	5.24	83	5.59	.617	.434	-.965	126	.336
Typicality	45	4.82	83	5.31	.310	.579	-1.753	126	.082
Cleverness									
Self-Rating	45	5.71	83	6.47	.213	.645	-2.518	126	.013*
Desirability	45	5.49	83	6.35	.060	.806	-2.166	126	.032*
Typicality	45	5.60	82	5.63	2.504	.116	-.118	125	.906

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Interestingness									
Self-Rating	45	5.89	83	5.41	1.685	.197	1.463	126	.146
Desirability	45	6.35	83	6.70	4.102	.045	-.933	78.805	.354
Typicality	45	5.58	83	5.46	3.014	.085	.422	126	.674
Business Sense									
Self-Rating	45	4.38	82	3.86	2.378	.126	1.320	125	.189
Desirability	45	5.29	83	5.19	.100	.753	.216	126	.829
Typicality	45	5.07	83	5.19	.610	.436	-.402	126	.688
Rationality									
Self-Rating	45	6.44	83	6.88	2.982	.087	-1.333	126	.185
Desirability	45	5.71	83	6.23	.422	.517	-1.226	126	.223
Typicality	45	5.09	83	5.40	.120	.730	-.996	126	.321
Creativity									
Self-Rating	45	5.84	82	6.38	.263	.609	-1.534	125	.127
Desirability	45	5.84	82	6.58	2.292	.133	-2.001	125	.048*
Typicality	45	5.71	82	5.73	2.110	.149	-.070	125	.945
Yielding									
Self-Rating	44	2.59	83	3.55	.718	.399	-2.606	125	.010*
Desirability	44	4.64	83	6.37	3.967	.049	-3.404	77.671	.001**
Typicality	44	4.73	83	5.18	.106	.745	-1.431	125	.155
Self-Awareness									
Self-Rating	45	6.71	82	7.13	.438	.509	-1.555	125	.122
Desirability	45	5.84	82	5.47	1.627	.204	.836	125	.405
Typicality	45	5.42	82	5.25	1.060	.305	.559	125	.577
Wholesomeness									
Self-Rating	44	5.84	83	5.96	1.884	.172	-.395	125	.694
Desirability	44	5.93	83	6.93	.063	.802	-2.814	125	.006**
Typicality	44	5.43	83	5.16	9.902	.002	.924	69.760	.359
Literary Capacity									
Self-Rating	45	6.47	81	5.18	4.755	.031	3.299	111.804	.001**
Desirability	45	5.91	81	4.46	.261	.610	3.477	124	.001**

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Typicality	45	5.47	81	4.36	.204	.652	3.346	124	.001**
Worldliness									
Self-Rating	45	6.07	82	4.77	8.890	.003	3.675	113.386	.000**
Desirability	45	5.84	82	5.16	.841	.361	1.656	125	.100
Typicality	44	4.84	82	4.89	.379	.539	-.171	124	.865
Shyness									
Self-Rating	45	4.18	82	4.35	.903	.344	-.433	125	.666
Desirability	45	4.60	82	4.28	2.783	.098	.768	125	.444
Typicality	45	4.24	81	4.57	.530	.468	-1.187	124	.237
Naivete									
Self-Rating	45	3.78	82	3.84	.388	.534	-.174	125	.862
Desirability	45	4.38	82	4.27	.979	.324	.249	125	.804
Typicality	45	4.51	82	4.82	1.045	.309	-1.007	125	.316
Controlling									
Self-Rating	45	5.64	82	5.43	6.606	.011	.597	112.602	.552
Desirability	44	5.66	82	4.01	.778	.380	3.755	124	.000**
Typicality	45	5.20	82	5.68	1.229	.270	-1.600	125	.112
Concern for Future									
Self-Rating	45	6.91	82	6.52	2.850	.094	1.108	125	.270
Desirability	45	6.33	81	5.02	.117	.733	3.373	124	.001**
Typicality	45	6.31	82	6.30	1.212	.273	.019	125	.985
Patience									
Self-Rating	45	5.09	82	5.34	.071	.790	-.632	125	.529
Desirability	45	7.13	82	7.78	5.004	.027	-2.136	79.849	.036*
Typicality	45	5.58	82	5.36	8.670	.004	.644	70.736	.521
Self-Righteousness									
Self-Rating	44	3.11	82	6.13	.083	.773	-9.358	124	.000**
Desirability	44	2.54	82	4.16	2.541	.113	-4.714	124	.000**
Typicality	44	3.73	82	5.62	.001	.977	-5.776	124	.000**
Maturity									
Self-Rating	45	6.60	82	6.58	.489	.486	.050	125	.961

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Desirability	45	7.15	82	7.52	4.206	.042	-1.117	81.030	.267
Typicality	45	5.87	82	5.77	.701	.404	.320	125	.750
Excitability									
Self-Rating	44	4.86	82	4.45	.007	.933	1.021	124	.309
Desirability	44	4.07	82	3.13	4.376	.038	2.437	68.823	.017*
Typicality	44	4.68	82	4.86	1.112	.294	-.654	124	.514
Melodramatic Tendency									
Self-Rating	45	3.33	82	3.82	.620	.432	-1.234	125	.220
Desirability	45	2.33	82	3.04	8.220	.005	-2.163	124.135	.032*
Typicality	45	4.98	81	5.32	6.771	.010	-1.198	110.368	.233
Willing to Take Risks									
Self-Rating	45	5.20	82	3.90	.022	.883	3.240	125	.002**
Desirability	45	4.82	82	4.21	4.403	.038	1.571	74.232	.120
Typicality	45	4.55	81	4.38	2.670	.105	.582	124	.562
Approval Seeking									
Self-Rating	43	4.49	82	5.41	.361	.549	-2.317	123	.022*
Desirability	43	4.44	82	4.62	.335	.564	-.427	123	.670
Typicality	42	5.26	82	6.44	.100	.753	-3.651	122	.000**
Athleticism									
Self-Rating	45	4.29	82	4.69	5.227	.024	-.961	77.262	.339
Desirability	45	6.11	82	6.8293	1.212	.273	-1.852	125	.066
Typicality	45	4.42	82	4.94	6.881	.010	-1.688	70.678	.096
Enthusiasm									
Self-Rating	45	5.95	82	5.23	1.293	.258	2.051	125	.042*
Desirability	45	6.00	82	6.77	4.914	.028	-2.120	76.707	.037*
Typicality	45	5.38	82	5.34	4.555	.035	.120	74.893	.905
Nosiness									
Self-Rating	45	2.49	82	2.93	3.170	.077	-1.275	125	.205
Desirability	45	2.13	82	2.40	7.101	.009	-.913	120.042	.363
Typicality	45	4.87	81	5.74	.154	.695	-2.628	124	.010*
Playfulness									

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	44	5.84	82	6.16	1.944	.166	-.920	124	.359
Desirability	44	5.23	82	5.94	.635	.427	-1.943	124	.054*
Typicality	44	5.11	82	5.28	1.610	.207	-.606	124	.545

Being Principled

	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	45	7.44	82	5.79	.323	.571	5.103	125	.000**
Desirability	45	7.27	81	4.95	1.953	.165	6.608	124	.000**
Typicality	45	6.20	81	4.80	10.018	.002	4.342	71.273	.000**

Conservatism

	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	45	2.73	82	3.08	2.383	.125	-.914	125	.363
Desirability	45	4.69	82	5.50	.316	.575	-1.929	125	.056
Typicality	45	4.58	82	4.89	.099	.753	-1.068	125	.288

Typicality

	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	44	3.84	82	4.62	2.429	.122	-2.075	124	.040*
Desirability	45	5.35	82	4.16	.082	.775	2.952	125	.004**
Typicality	45	5.07	82	5.26	.071	.790	-.644	125	.521

Centre of Attention

	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	45	3.00	82	3.82	6.036	.015	-2.281	106.463	.025*
Desirability	45	2.75	82	3.74	.403	.527	-3.032	125	.003**
Typicality	45	4.27	82	5.33	.852	.358	-3.399	125	.001**

Rebelliousness

	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	45	5.02	82	4.96	.600	.440	.148	125	.882
Desirability	45	3.31	82	2.79	1.073	.302	1.449	125	.150
Typicality	45	4.15	82	4.74	1.323	.252	-2.002	125	.047*

Secretiveness

	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	45	4.47	82	5.40	9.899	.002	-2.594	114.897	.011*
Desirability	45	4.71	82	4.79	.893	.346	-.228	125	.820
Typicality	45	4.42	82	4.67	1.036	.311	-.893	125	.373

Mischievousness

	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	43	3.30	82	3.91	11.229	.001	-1.696	113.321	.093
Desirability	44	3.14	82	5.71	.639	.426	-7.237	124	.000**
Typicality	44	3.59	82	5.00	.822	.366	-5.085	124	.000**

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Honesty									
Self-Rating	45	7.22	82	7.36	.018	.893	-.528	125	.598
Desirability	45	7.09	82	7.86	4.795	.030	-2.535	83.860	.013*
Typicality	45	5.44	81	5.69	18.277	.000	-.759	62.944	.451
Flirtatiousness									
Self-Rating	44	3.45	82	3.50	.004	.949	-.108	124	.914
Desirability	44	4.32	82	6.33	1.042	.309	-4.935	124	.000**
Typicality	44	4.77	82	5.79	.901	.344	-3.402	124	.001**
Choosy									
Self-Rating	45	5.22	82	4.90	.730	.395	.844	125	.400
Desirability	45	3.82	82	3.17	1.628	.204	1.708	125	.090
Typicality	45	4.80	82	5.47	.271	.604	-2.352	125	.020*
Open Mindedness									
Self-Rating	45	7.24	82	7.08	1.211	.273	.513	125	.609
Desirability	45	6.22	82	5.58	.119	.731	1.522	125	.130
Typicality	45	5.13	82	5.19	4.478	.036	-.179	75.356	.859
Cleanliness									
Self-Rating	45	6.38	82	6.61	.120	.730	-.673	125	.502
Desirability	45	7.55	82	8.10	9.927	.002	-1.915	75.557	.059
Typicality	45	6.27	82	6.16	1.053	.307	.378	125	.706
Perfectionism									
Self-Rating	45	6.11	82	6.22	.479	.490	-.292	125	.771
Desirability	45	6.18	82	6.68	.394	.531	-1.380	125	.170
Typicality	45	5.31	82	5.50	.501	.480	-.678	125	.499
Discipline									
Self-Rating	45	5.93	82	6.05	.735	.393	-.310	125	.757
Desirability	45	6.84	82	7.39	3.192	.076	-1.765	125	.080
Typicality	45	5.73	82	5.38	1.343	.249	1.293	125	.198
Common Sense									
Self-Rating	44	6.66	82	7.06	1.312	.254	-1.467	124	.145
Desirability	44	6.61	82	7.33	.234	.630	-1.974	124	.051*

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Typicality	44	5.84	81	5.60	6.056	.015	.673	67.455	.503
Prejudiced									
Self-Rating	44	2.36	82	2.83	.011	.916	-1.519	124	.131
Desirability	43	2.63	82	2.91	1.266	.263	-.767	123	.444
Typicality	44	4.59	81	4.70	1.277	.261	-.410	123	.683
Helpfulness									
Self-Rating	45	6.71	82	6.30	.333	.565	1.363	125	.175
Desirability	45	7.27	82	7.77	1.922	.168	-1.604	125	.111
Typicality	45	6.18	82	5.72	5.694	.019	1.556	125	.122
Defends Own Beliefs									
Self-Rating	45	6.55	82	6.78	1.939	.166	-.704	125	.483
Desirability	45	5.20	82	4.66	.270	.604	1.208	125	.229
Typicality	45	5.51	82	5.57	9.196	.003	-.178	72.255	.859
Being Materialistic									
Self-Rating	44	3.45	82	3.85	2.118	.148	-1.071	124	.286
Desirability	44	3.45	82	3.11	.396	.530	.935	124	.352
Typicality	44	5.00	81	5.85	.403	.527	-2.921	123	.004**
Jealous Tendency									
Self-Rating	45	3.60	82	4.22	.257	.613	-1.539	125	.126
Desirability	45	3.11	82	3.34	.292	.590	-.628	125	.531
Typicality	45	5.44	82	6.04	.167	.684	-2.081	125	.039*
Interest in Children									
Self-Rating	45	5.69	82	4.72	10.100	.002	2.053	107.095	.043*
Desirability	45	7.07	82	7.60	.098	.755	-1.454	125	.149
Typicality	44	6.48	82	6.38	.222	.639	.315	124	.753
Efficiency									
Self-Rating	44	6.50	82	6.02	.393	.532	1.513	124	.133
Desirability	44	7.29	82	7.06	.011	.916	.721	124	.472
Typicality	44	6.11	82	5.54	.566	.453	1.920	124	.057
Moodiness									
Self-Rating	45	4.29	82	4.73	.019	.890	-1.062	125	.290

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Desirability	45	2.11	81	2.59	4.292	.040	-1.550	117.959	.124
Typicality	45	4.38	82	5.65	.186	.667	-4.150	125	.000**
Emotionality									
Self-Rating	45	5.89	82	6.28	1.627	.205	-.984	125	.327
Desirability	45	5.29	82	5.35	.149	.700	-.161	125	.872
Typicality	45	6.29	82	6.33	.325	.570	-.144	125	.886
Emotional Expression									
Self-Rating	45	5.78	82	5.35	1.486	.225	.980	125	.329
Desirability	45	6.18	82	6.44	1.089	.299	-.697	125	.487
Typicality	45	5.84	82	5.67	9.950	.002	.518	69.259	.606
Consistency									
Self-Rating	44	6.20	82	6.11	.466	.496	.294	124	.769
Desirability	44	6.82	82	6.88	.198	.657	-.184	124	.855
Typicality	44	5.50	82	5.19	10.391	.002	1.091	68.029	.279
Attention to Appearances									
Self-Rating	45	4.11	82	4.47	1.501	.223	-.943	125	.348
Desirability	44	4.41	82	6.40	.073	.787	-4.922	124	.000**
Typicality	45	5.80	82	6.68	3.419	.067	-2.890	125	.005**
Persuasiveness									
Self-Rating	44	5.09	82	5.34	4.782	.031	-.729	103.029	.468
Desirability	44	5.07	82	4.77	2.651	.106	.682	124	.497
Typicality	44	5.09	81	5.09	.729	.395	.017	123	.987
Sexual Promiscuity									
Self-Rating	44	2.89	82	4.15	2.956	.088	-2.891	124	.005**
Desirability	44	2.20	82	3.76	10.383	.002	-3.877	112.514	.000**
Typicality	44	3.54	81	4.80	7.534	.007	-3.794	72.765	.000**
Childlike									
Self-Rating	45	2.80	82	2.80	.651	.421	-.014	125	.989
Desirability	45	1.93	82	2.94	13.749	.000	-3.415	123.046	.001**
Typicality	45	2.95	82	3.52	1.662	.200	-2.019	125	.046*
Weakness									

Trait	PT		PL		Levene's Test		t-test		
	N	M	N	M	F	p	t	df	p
Self-Rating	45	2.95	81	3.57	3.828	.053	-2.237	108.033	.027*
Desirability	45	3.11	81	4.10	2.792	.097	-2.141	124	.034*
Typicality	45	3.64	81	4.22	.309	.579	-2.074	124	.040*
Aggressiveness									
Self-Rating	45	3.00	82	2.91	.140	.709	.231	125	.818
Desirability	45	1.49	82	1.49	.336	.563	.007	125	.995
Typicality	45	3.15	82	4.04	5.027	.027	-2.827	75.590	.006**
Stinginess									
Self-Rating	44	1.93	82	3.49	19.909	.000	-5.212	117.868	.000**
Desirability	44	1.79	82	2.43	2.505	.116	-2.383	124	.019*
Typicality	44	3.50	81	4.25	.201	.654	-2.831	123	.005**
Broad Interests									
Self-Rating	44	6.48	82	6.38	4.798	.030	.334	114.293	.739
Desirability	44	6.16	82	6.02	.021	.885	.340	124	.734
Typicality	44	5.20	82	5.21	3.317	.071	-.009	124	.993
Complicated									
Self-Rating	45	4.62	82	5.65	.019	.890	-2.437	125	.016*
Desirability	44	2.75	82	2.97	.154	.696	-.634	124	.528
Typicality	45	5.24	82	5.00	.482	.489	.753	125	.453
Competitiveness									
Self-Rating	44	5.00	82	4.05	.153	.696	2.477	124	.015*
Desirability	44	4.59	82	4.33	1.261	.264	.637	124	.525
Typicality	44	5.07	82	5.01	3.785	.054	.173	71.681	.863
Leadership Ability									
Self-Rating	44	5.68	82	4.88	19.828	.000	2.259	122.967	.026*
Desirability	44	5.38	82	4.23	1.195	.276	2.606	124	.010*
Typicality	44	5.14	82	4.97	4.940	.028	.445	73.177	.657
Forcefulness									
Self-Rating	45	6.33	81	4.09	5.618	.019	6.505	112.478	.000**
Desirability	45	5.91	81	3.22	2.861	.093	6.907	124	.000**
Typicality	45	5.91	81	4.84	13.483	.000	3.149	70.030	.002**

Note. N= number of participants, M= mean score, F= Levene's statistic, t= Student t-statistic, df= degrees of freedom

*p < 0.01, **p < 0.001